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Many educators feel that education should be the great equalizer of the conditions of men, the balance wheel of the social machinery. Yet, for many students of the District of Columbia the wheel is, and has been, out of balance.

This problem is not of recent origin. It has existed for a long time. Strayer and Passow conducted extensive studies of the Washington, D.C. Public School System during the twentieth century and released many findings and recommendations.

Many programs have been initiated as a result of the findings and recommendations cited by Strayer and Passow, however, many were ill conceived and implemented. A recent program, the "Competitive Partnership Reading Program," an instructional program in which major publishing companies compete with each other, but in partnership with the school system to upgrade reading achievement, was launched in the Title I schools during the 1972-1973 school year.
The purpose of this study was to ascertain if the Competitive Partnership Reading Program and parental involvement made a significant difference in mean reading scores of second and third grade Title I students during the first year of operation.

Mean reading scores made by second grade students on the California Achievement Tests between September, 1971 and October, 1972 were compared with the mean reading scores made by those same students as third graders on the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills between October, 1972 and May, 1973. The t-test technique was used to determine if the Competitive Partnership Reading Program made a significant difference in mean reading scores after one year of the program.

October, 1972 mean reading scores were compared with May, 1973 mean reading scores using the t-test technique to determine if any one of the three Competitive Partnership Reading Programs was more significant than the other two in upgrading reading achievement for second and third grade Title I students.

October, 1972 mean reading scores were compared with May, 1973 mean reading scores using the t-test technique to determine if there was a significant difference in reading scores of second and third grade students who attended schools with highly active or low parent involvement.

Specific conclusions were formulated on the basis of the major findings relative to the testing of the null hypotheses. The conclusions
formulated are as follows:

1. There was no significant difference in mean reading scores of Title I students when scores made while the students were in the second grade during 1971 were compared with scores the students made when they were in the third grade during 1972-1973, which was the first year of the Competitive Partnership Reading Program.

2. There was no significant difference in mean reading scores of second and third grade Title I students who used any one of the three Competitive Partnership Reading Programs.

3. There was a significant difference when mean reading scores made by second grade Title I students who attended schools with highly active parent involvement were compared with mean reading scores of students who attended schools with low parent involvement.

4. There was a significant difference when mean reading scores made by third grade Title I students who attended schools with highly active parent involvement were compared with mean reading scores of students who attended schools with low parent involvement.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

For more than a century American educators have been developing an educational system designed to meet the needs of the various students whom they have the responsibility of teaching.

During the early 1900's John Dewey emphasized a fundamental expression of values, relationships, and processes flowing directly out of the American experience, which to many educators became known as "the Dewey philosophy." This philosophy played an important part in the changes that took place in the education of Americans. It helped in the development of curricula, the modification of many instructional materials, and the development of classroom organizational patterns.¹ However, many educators and concerned citizens still feel that the public schools have failed to educate the masses, especially minorities and less affluent students, for the ever changing society. Therefore, there has been a constant outcry for educational reform.

Such an outcry is not a recent phenomenon. During the 1920's and the 1930's, criticism of the public schools led to many attempts at reform. Those attempts failed, however, because too much emphasis was placed on "child-centered education" and not enough on subject matter. Throughout the 1920's "freedom versus authority," and "child-centered education" were the slogans of the time. It was realized too late that freedom for the child was important, but not at the expense of eliminating adult guidance.²

The 1950's saw one of the largest educational reform movements in American history. This reform movement produced many changes. Team teaching, the Joplin plan, ability grouping, educational technology, and individualized instruction were but a few that were attempted. However, the schools remained largely unchanged. This movement failed to accomplish what many hoped it would because the movement placed too much emphasis on subject matter and, for the most part, ignored the individual child. The greatest blunder was that educators failed to study the educational history, particularly the history of progressive education and its successes and failures. In essence, educators were not aware that almost everything they were saying and trying, had in many instances been said and tried before.

The feeling that the educational system is not "right" for the future needs and responsibilities of American society has continued to grow into the

²Hollis, p. 8.
1970's. It is asserted that the system has not met the needs of middle class suburban white students any more than it has met the needs of less affluent blacks. In many instances, teaching is still predominately telling and questioning by the teacher, with students responding one by one or occasionally in chorus. Textbooks are still the instrument of learning and teaching. Homework is still devoted to detail, most of it trivial.3

When the question is asked, "What's wrong with our urban schools?" we can expect an endless list from persons in all walks of life, including theorizing educators as well as "the self-appointed experts" from other fields. A partial list might include:

1. Constant Political and Legal Barriers.
2. Massive Retardation; Low Achievement of Pupils.
3. Poor Teacher Attitude.
4. High Drop-out Rates.
5. Lack of or Too Much of Community Involvement.
6. High Rate of Adult Illiteracy.
7. Lack of Early Childhood Education.
8. Inadequate Instructional Facilities and Maintenance.
9. Ineffecive School Board; Decentralization.
10. Improper Organization for Instruction.
11. Inadequate School Finances.
12. Ineffective use of or Lack of Paraprofessionals.
13. Fragmented Innovations and Irrelevant Curriculum.
15. Poor School-Community Relations.
16. Inadequate System of Teacher Recruitment and Staff Development.
17. Inequities, Inconsistencies and Inadequacies of Funds Administered by State Agencies.

19. Too many Non-Certified Teachers.
20. No Teacher or Administrative Accountability.
21. High Pupil Mobility Rate.
22. Unreliable Tests.
23. Irrelevant Teacher Training.  

Even though the above list seems endless, reformers are beginning to recognize that schools for too long have been asked to assume roles which they are unprepared to fulfill without the aid of other societal institutions. Schools have been expected for too long to pass on traditions, instill high moral values, acquaint children with the world, and prepare them for future undefined job markets; while the society of which the schools are a part has not assumed its share of the responsibility.

Hillway describes the situation in the following manner:

Schools reflect the society they serve. Many of the failures ascribed to contemporary education are in fact failures of our society as a whole. A society that is indifferent to its heritage cannot expect the schools to make good the differences. A society that slurs over fundamental principles and takes refuge in the superficial and the ephemeral cannot demand that its schools instruct in abiding moral values. A society proudly preoccupied with its own material accomplishments and well being cannot fairly expect its schools to teach that the snug warmth of security is less meaningful than the bracing venture of freedom.  

---


The problem confronting urban education are not of recent origin. Such problems as inadequate financing, increased enrollment, insufficient staffing, low reading scores, and ineffective curricula have existed for a considerable period of time. However, the surfacing of the problems at the national level has caused the United States to engage in a massive effort to upgrade the achievement of urban children.

One effort was the War on Poverty, initiated by President Lyndon B. Johnson in 1964. The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 began the War on Poverty. Some programs started under the War on Poverty were: Upward Bound, Work Study, Job Corps, and Head Start.

In the Upward Bound Program poor high school boys and girls were given help. During the summer the students spent eight weeks at a college or boarding school. There they studied and received individual attention from the teachers. During the school year the students spent extra time in school, doctors checked their health, and they received money for their daily expenses. In 1968 the students received ten dollars a week during the summer program and five dollars a week during the school year.

In the Work-Study program college students from poor families held part-time jobs. This kind of aid gave students meaningful work to do while they earned money. Their salary was paid by the Federal government.

The Job Corps program was organized to train men and women from sixteen to twenty-one for jobs. They lived at Job Corps Centers and were
trained in reading, mathematics, and other subjects. They also learned how to operate many types of machines and to qualify for specific jobs.

Finally, Head Start was a program for pre-school children. As part of Head Start, children received medical care, were helped to expand their oral language, were taught about the world around them, and were taught how to get along with others. Most important, they were taught beginning reading skills. Each child ate at least one meal a day in school.  

Another effort that was started during the sixties was the enactment of the Title I Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, which offered grants to public educational agencies to meet the specific needs of low income families.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) was signed into law April 11, 1965, but in November 1966, Public Law 89750 amended Title I by providing for the inclusion of Indians, migrant, and institutionalized children in the program. Public Law 90247, passed in January 1968, made a number of administrative revisions in the program. In April 1970, Public Law 91230 provided bonus payment to teachers under Title I, authorized special grants for states exceeding the national effort in public elementary and secondary education, for local districts with high concentrations of poor children, and required districts to equalize services between Title I and non-

---

Title I Schools. The Congressional Declaration of Policy is as follows:

The official Title for ESEA, Title I reads, Financial Assistance to Local Educational Agencies for the Education of Children of Low-Income Families. The opening paragraph, Section 101, of Title I contains the following "Declaration of Policy."

In recognition of the special education needs of children of low-income families and the impact that concentration of low-income families have on the ability of local educational agencies to support adequate educational programs, Congress hereby declares it to be the policy of the United States to provide financial assistance (as set forth in the following parts of this title) to local educational agencies serving areas with concentrations of children from low-income families to expand and improve their educational programs by various means (including preschool programs) which contribute particularly to meeting the special educational needs of educationally deprived children.

Much has happened in the field of education since the enactment of ESEA, and the War on Poverty, which intended to expand and improve elementary and secondary school programs for educationally deprived children in low-income areas. However, they have not been the answers to all of the problems that exist in educating urban children.

In view of the basic problems and forces that are still prevalent in America today, there are many questions that must be answered and many controversial issues that must be explored before one can talk about the


significance of ESEA and the War on Poverty effort. Some questions are:

1. Can large sums of money alone provide equal educational opportunities for students who have been neglected for such a long period of time?

2. Without additional training can the same administrators who initiated unsuccessful programs in the past, design and implement new programs which will be successful?

3. Can persons outside the field of education be held accountable for the education of urban children?

4. Are there specific reading materials and programs that are better for urban children?

These questions are very important because too many school systems are seeking educational panaceas, and staking all on the introduction of new plans and programs, and giving little attention to the theories involved.

Statement of the Problem

For many years large sums of money have been allocated to the schools in the District of Columbia for the purpose of eradicating low scores in reading, however, there are many students still reading below grade level. Within the last few years the Washington, D.C. Title I schools have been experimenting with a plan, "The Competitive Partnership Reading Program" in an effort to find the best program to improve the reading scores of their students.
The purpose of the investigation is to ascertain if there is any relationship between the implementation of the Competitive Partnership Program and reading gains of Title I students in the District of Columbia Title I schools.

**Definition of Terms**

1. **Competitive Partnership**
   - An instrumental program in which major publishing companies compete with one another, but in partnership with a school system, to upgrade reading levels of specific students.

2. **Title I Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA)**
   - An act to expand and improve elementary and secondary school programs for educationally deprived children in low-income areas.

3. **Title I Project**
   - One or more activities designed to meet the special needs of educationally deprived children in a local school district.

4. **Reading**
   - A complex process in which the reader communicates with the writer.

5. **Educationally deprived child**
   - A child who needs special educational assistance to perform at the grade level for his age. The term also includes
6. Local Education Agency

- A public board of education or other public authority legally responsible for providing public elementary and secondary education in a city, county, township, school district, or other political subdivisions of a state.

7. Performance Contracting

- A process whereby a school district enters into a contract with an outside firm, or an internal teacher or administrative group, to accelerate achievement of a limited number of students with reimbursement based on the actual performance of the students.

8. Underachievers

- Those students who fail to learn, even though all indications are that they have the potential to achieve to a certain level. These are the students who are performing children with special educational needs resulting from poverty, neglect, handicaps, delinquency, or cultural, economic, ethnic, or linguistic isolation from the general community.
well below their predicted level of achievement according to test measures in reading.

9. Phoneme
- A unit of speech sound.

10. Grapheme
- A letter or group of letters that represent a phoneme.

11. Phonemics
- A set of techniques used to identify and describe, especially in terms of distribution, the bundles of sound contrasts that constitute the structural units that mark the word-patterns. It is the phonemes of the language that alphabetic writing represents.

The Study

In September, 1972, "The Competitive Partnership Program in Reading," a new approach to quality education and accountability was launched in the Title I elementary schools of the District of Columbia.

The purpose of the program was to upgrade the reading scores of Title I students in grades one through three.

Since many previous programs failed to educate many of the students for constructive roles in our ever changing society, this study analyzes the
Competitive Partnership Program to see how it proposes to upgrade reading scores. This study focused primarily on the first year of the program, and provides an analysis of the processes that were employed in its operation.

**Purpose of the Investigation**

The purposes of this study: (1) to conduct an intensive descriptive analysis of the Competitive Partnership Reading Program from its inception in the Fall of 1972 through the Summer of 1973, (2) to ascertain whether there have been any significant changes in reading scores since the inception of the Competitive Partnership Program in reading, and (3) to explain other factors which may be responsible for changes in the reading scores of the Title I students in the District of Columbia School System.

**Statement of Hypotheses**

In pursuance of the primary aim of this investigation the major hypotheses were stated in the null form. That is, there will be no statistically significant difference between comparative groups. The specific hypotheses are:

Hypothesis I - There will be no significant difference in composite reading scores of Title I students when scores made while the students were in the second grade during 1971-1972 were compared with scores the students made when they were in the third grade during 1972-1973, which was the first year of the Comparative Partnership Program.
Hypothesis II - There will be no significant difference in composite reading scores of second and third grade Title I students attending schools using any one of the three Competitive Partnership Programs.

Hypothesis III - There will be no significant relationship between scores made in reading by second and third grade Title I students who attended schools with highly active or low parent involvement.

Limitations of the Study

This study is limited in that:

1. The data obtained for the study reflect gross statistics about schools and very little about individual students.

2. The investigator was unable to obtain necessary data because of the confidential nature of the data in the Districts files.

3. The Competitive Partnership Reading Program has been tried only with Title I students.

4. The test scores used in this study were those made by students who had participated in the Competitive Partnership Reading Program for only eight school months.

5. The Competitive Partnership Reading Program had only been in operation for a year when this study was initiated.

6. Factors such as teacher training, enthusiasm, work
habits and other materials being used with the three programs could not be controlled.

7. A small number of responses to the questionnaires were returned.

8. Non-Public Title I students were not included in the study.

Significance of the Study

It is hoped that this study will serve to, (1) call attention to the types of programs being used to educate the "educationally disadvantaged" youth, (2) describe the implementation of the Competitive Partnership Reading Program, (3) investigate the significance of specific reading materials as they relate to academic achievement, (4) investigate the significance of parental involvement as it relates to academic achievement, and (5) represent a pioneer study upon which other researchers may build.
Chapter I provided a brief review of the basic forces, movements, and attempts at educational reform during the 20th century, and efforts to upgrade achievement of urban children. It also provided a statement of the problem, definition of terms, the study, purpose of the investigation, hypotheses, limitations, and significance of the study.

This chapter will provide a brief description of the beginning of public education in Washington, D.C.; the two major studies of the District of Columbia School System; educational reform efforts initiated by the District of Columbia School System, and Performance Contracting, a recent educational reform attempted in other major cities.

**Historical Perspective**

Since 1805, when Thomas Jefferson agreed to become a trustee for the Public Schools of the District of Columbia, the schools have been a focus of conflict and crises, mirrored throughout the nation.

One of the major crises in the early nineteenth century was engendered by the absence of a regular source of funds for public education. In 1818,
when the taxes on slaves, licenses, and liquor proved to be inadequate for supporting public education, the city council authorized a series of lotteries from which the interest on two-thirds of the principle collected was to be used for this purpose. However, other expenditure demands caused the council to renege on this commitment. By the late 1840's the mayor, William Seaton, asked the council to pass a tax on assessible property so that free schooling could be provided for every white child in the city.\(^9\)

In May 1862, shortly after the emancipation in the District, Washington and Georgetown were required by law to open public schools for blacks.\(^10\) At first ten percent of the taxes on Negro property was set aside to pay for the schools. A separate board of trustees was set up to administer the "colored Schools". The first school for blacks was in the Ebenezer Church at 2nd and C. Streets, S.E., but little more was done before the end of the Civil War because of the inadequacy of funds. In 1868 the Secretary of the Interior appointed a black to the board of trustees, and the board placed George F. T. Cook in charge as the first Superintendent of Colored Schools.\(^11\) During this time, however, Washington's black students, citizens, and administrators were deprived of many of the privileges and educational

---


\(^{10}\)Ibid., p. 36.

\(^{11}\)Ibid., p. 36.
opportunities which whites received. For example, black students received fewer materials, less money per pupil was spent on black students, and black administrators had very few opportunities to communicate with the other division. As late as 1939, Marion Anderson was denied the privilege of performing in an auditorium at a white school even though no black school auditorium large enough was available.\textsuperscript{12}

Thus, Washington, D.C. operated under a dual school system for many years. However, with the passing of time and the struggle for equality in education, the two systems finally merged into one, when the Supreme Court declared school separation by race to be unconstitutional in 1954.\textsuperscript{13} This, however, did not end many of the long-standing problems. As late as 1967, Julius Hobson brought a suit against the School System, charging inequality in spending, which caused Judge Skelly Wright to rule that the School System must equalize per pupil spending.\textsuperscript{14}

The Public School System of the District of Columbia has been burdened with problems similar, yet different, from those that plague other large cities. This results from the District's unique relationship to the federal government.


whereby Congress acts as a "super board of education."

The general control of the Public Schools of the District of Columbia is vested in an elected Board of Education. The Board of Education appoints the Superintendent of schools for a term of three years. However, in recent years the System has had few Superintendents who have served their full terms. The Board sets policy for the operation of the public schools, determines the entire curricula, plans the program of school construction, and many other related tasks.¹⁵

To a greater or lesser degree, many of the same problems that are prevalent in the District are some of the problems that exist in other large cities. But, because they are found elsewhere in no way mitigates their impact on the Washington, D.C. population. Thus, the District faces the challenge of providing massive remediation of existing learning problems, and designing programs for the thousands of children who will be entering in years to come.

Previous Studies of the D.C. Public School System

The District of Columbia School System has sought help with its problems on two occasions within the last twenty-five years. Through the

Strayer Survey and the Passow Study. These reports presented a multitude of findings and recommendations.

The Strayer Survey

The first of these major studies of the Washington Public School System was the Strayer Survey. This survey was one of the most exhaustive, most comprehensive surveys ever completed on a major school system.

In 1948, the chairmen of the subcommittees on the District of Columbia appropriations of the respective appropriation committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives authorized a "complete survey of the public-school system with respect to the adequacy of the present plant and personnel, as well as the educational methods and practices."16

The survey was conducted under the supervision of George Strayer, who had extensive experience in the field of public school education. The field work and the preparation of the survey were carried on during the period from July 1, 1948 to February, 1949. The final report consisted of fifteen chapters, of which 900 pages were findings and recommendations concerning all phases of school administration, operations and maintenance of buildings.

One outstanding problem cited in the survey was the cumbersome budget process in the system. An analysis by Nickens (figure 1) represents an adequate summary of the most important ones.

### FIGURE 1

**An Analysis of the Strayer Survey**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Cumbersome committee system involving Board in Administrative details more appropriately handled by the Superintendent.</td>
<td>Far greater discretion given to superintendent in the administration of matters of procedure and in carrying on routine activities of schools.</td>
<td>Not yet contemplated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Board of Education should be policy making body committee system; lend itself to administrative action.</td>
<td>Reorganization of administrative supervisory staff at top level, with several associate superintendents in charge.</td>
<td>1969 major reorganization of the school system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Need for reform in the administration of business affairs.</td>
<td>More flexibility, fiscal and administrative freedom in business affairs.</td>
<td>Establishment of metered mail which might result in economy and a central store for supplies which might produce savings in time and money.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings</td>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td>Actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Lack of referral clinic for special services;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Lack of superintendent services for handicapped;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Inadequate budget.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Inadequate program for financing the school system in the District of Columbia</td>
<td>Modification of taxing system to produce 15 million to 20 million dollars additional revenue to balance the District budget.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase of federal payments to a more equitable relationship with the value of federal property in the District.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Inadequate pay-as-you-go building program</td>
<td>Funds should be advanced by the federal government on a definite repayment schedule.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Authorization to issue serial bonds to be paid from debt service appropriations from district revenues.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings</td>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td>Actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Need for simplification of the system of fiscal</td>
<td>Authorities responsible for operation of district</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>control</td>
<td>government. Should be given fiscal powers commensurate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with their responsibilities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to Nicken's analysis as shown in figure 1, the Strayer survey found a variety of viewpoints among elementary school teachers as to how children should be taught and how they learn. The viewpoints uncovered were: (1) one group of teachers believed in the child development philosophy with its emphasis upon purposive learning and the whole child, (2) another group believed in the traditional philosophy of elementary education with its emphasis upon the mastery of facts and skills, and, (3) a third group believed in systematic textbook instruction, and a great deal of practice and drill as a way to educate children.  

Strayer concluded that since these broad interpretations of how children should be taught and how children learn co-exist in the same system, there was not a clear understanding of the philosophy of child development and the

---


18 Strayer, p. 171.
experience curriculum, therefore, teachers should be allowed time to engage in in-service training and staff development.  

In essence what Strayer discovered in 1948-49 about the D.C. Public School System had been voiced in 1922 by Superintendent Frank Ballow.

Superintendent Ballow gave this viewpoint on the D.C. Public School System:

The confusion existing is hardly credible. Authority and responsibility are hopelessly tied up with red tape. The bureau center methods in use are entirely inadequate to the task. An attempt is made to manage a large city school system by small town methods, and the results is disastrous. Educational conditions in Washington from an administrative point of view are among the worst to be found in any city in the union and the school system is behind that of cities elsewhere of equal size in the union. The superintendency of the schools of Washington is generally agreed as one of the most difficult and most undesirable positions of the United States.

The Passow Study -
Towards Better Schools

The Passow Study was introduced eighteen years after the Strayer Survey. Its purpose was to conduct a comprehensive fifteen months study of current programs and practices, and to make recommendations which, if implemented, would insure quality education for Washington's population.

---

19 Strayer, p. 214.


The study was conducted by thirty-three task forces, each concentrating on a specific problem area. Eighty-one task force chairman and consultants, ninety-seven graduate associates and students, and a resident staff of six research assistants, probed all aspects of education in Washington, D.C.22

The members of the group visited numerous schools and classes, interviewed students, staff and parents, examined school records and reports from various agencies, and examined available studies.

The major difference between the Strayer Survey and the Passow Study was that the latter was authorized by the Board of Education instead of the Federal Government.

Passow and Strayer discovered that: (1) the cumbersome fiscal process in the District was one of the reasons for problems in initiating new programs, (2) that there was a great deficiency in Special Education Programs and, (3) that there was a need for developing a long-range budgeting mechanism.

Aside from those broad areas of problems, the Passow Study cited some very specific problems. The findings revealed a school system that had:

1. A low level of scholastic achievement as measured by performance on standardized tests.
2. A curriculum which, with certain expectations, has not been especially developed for or adopted to an urban population.

22 Passow, p. 10.
3. An increasing de facto residential segregation for the District as a whole, which has resulted in a largely re-segregated school system.

4. Staffing patterns which have left the schools with large numbers of "temporary" Teachers and heightened the District's vulnerability at a time of national teacher shortage.

5. Guidance services which are unable to reach the heart of the personnel welfare needs of the pupils population.

6. In-service teacher education programs which fall short of providing adequately for the continuing education essential for professional growth.

7. A promotion system which has lacked the basic ingredients of career development and training for supervisory and administrative leadership.

8. A "reacting school system" rather than an initiating one insofar as innovation, long-range planning and program development are concerned.

9. Budgetary and business procedures which are needlessly complicated and cumbersome.

10. Substantial numbers of school buildings which are less than adequate for conducting a full educational program and in which the maintenance program lags badly.

11. Poor communication between the schools and the communities they serve.

12. A Board of Education whose operating procedures appear to be unusually cumbersome so that an inordinate amount of time is spent on repetitive debate and on administrative detail rather than policy leadership. 23

---

23 Passow, p. 9.
The Passow Study contained major and minor, short and long range recommendations. Some specific recommendations cited were:

1. That a substantial rebuilding of instruction be undertaken, where the entire staff is drawn into the redevelopment efforts.

2. That the District extend schooling downward, which would make it possible to serve all of the four-year olds and selected three-year olds.

3. That the District strive for better racial balance of staffs in all schools for all children.

4. That the teacher aide program and the use of paraprofessionals be expanded.

5. That the Community Board of Education be elected by voters from districts and involved for three-year terms.

6. That eight Community Superintendents be appointed as heads of decentralized subsystems, charged with overall responsibility for the operation of the elementary and secondary schools in the area.

7. That schools be transformed into community schools.24

The Passow Study combined with the Strayer Survey presented the District of Columbia School System with a gigantic task, that of studying the findings and implementing the many recommendations that were contained in the reports.

Passow wrote in his challenge to the District of Columbia Public Schools that:

24 Passow, p. 11.
Historically, city school systems have been among the most sophisticated and innovative. Only recently, have they lost the leadership thrust. The District can and must take advantage of its peculiar setting in the nation's capital, of its unusual resources of personnel and places, to move up front in demonstrating quality education for a diverse population.25

Dr. Passow ended his challenge with:

It is precisely this diversity which presents the District Schools simultaneously with tremendous difficulties and the chance for the profound accomplishments.26

Even though the Strayer Survey and the Passow Study were conducted eighteen years apart, many of the same problems that were uncovered in the first study still existed when the latter study was done. Some of those problems were:

1. The need for pre-school education.
2. The need for in-service training for teachers.
3. The need for community involvement.
4. The need to solve budgetary problems, and the cumbersome operating procedures of the Board of Education.

It appeared that the District of Columbia School System had made very little progress in eliminating many of the problems and implementing many

26Ibid., p. 103.
of the recommendations cited in the Strayer Survey, but because of the magnitude of many of the findings and recommendations, they could not be eradicated as fast as many would have liked them to be. According to Nickens, two problems which appeared to prevent adequate implementation were: (1) the cost of reform and (2) the lack of authority on the part of both the Board of Education and Washington, D.C. citizens to implement a report which was initiated, supervised and funded by the Congress of the United States.\(^7\)

Regardless of the progress that had been made by the School System regarding the findings and recommendations thus far, the Strayer and the Passow studies were successful in making educators of the District aware of what they must do to provide quality education for the youths of the nation's capital.

Strayer and Passow presented the School System with a challenge and the System accepted the challenge as indicated in its attempts at educational reform.

**Attempts at Educational Reform in the District Public School System**

Even though the educational picture of the District of Columbia School System appeared bleak, there were some examples of quality education, of

\(^{27}\) Nickens, p. 46.
dedicated and creative professionals at all levels, and efforts to initiate new programs. One such program was the Model School Division.

Model School Division

One program which the Passow Study stated came close to having really innovative programs was the Model School Division, which was organized in the Spring of 1964. The idea for the Model School came from many sources, the Washington Action for Youth, the President's Science Advisory Committee, and, most importantly, from the growing volume of interest in an implementation of experimental programs.28

The Model School Division consisted of twenty-one schools and five preschool centers located in four square miles of the Cardozo and Shaw areas. These areas were considered as having greater problems than any other section of the city.

The Model School Division was a model system within the regular system, designed to respond to the need for coordination and support of a new instructional program, and to implement strategies for educational change within the system.

One of the most effective components of the Model School was the "Innovation Team," a group of selected teachers charged with in-service

28 D. C. Public Schools, Facts and Figures, p. 22.
training, follow-up assistance in the classroom, delivering supplies and providing advice and encouragement to teachers in the system. During the time the "Innovation Team" was functioning, many educational reforms were initiated. Some of the reforms that made a lasting impression on the system city-wide were:

1. Coordinating programs to improve instruction in reading, mathematics, science and social studies.

2. Conducting workshops and learning sessions for teachers in individualized instruction, Tri-wall carpentry and writing.

3. Gaining entry into schools by the members and meeting with principals and teachers to describe their services and accessibility.

4. Working to train substitutes.

5. Conducting staff development sessions.

6. Working with community groups. 29

According to Cort the team was effective in the following ways:

1. Stimulating many teachers to consider alternative strategies in teaching and instruction.

2. Providing teachers with methodological tools with enabling attitudes for improving general instruction and the learning climate.

3. Serving as a linking agent for teachers.

---

4. Establishing human relations meeting with principals and faculties in schools.

5. Meeting with parent groups.

6. Providing opportunities for teachers from different schools to discuss common problems.\(^\text{30}\)

Passow in 1967, three years after the inception of the Model School Division, made the following observations. He stated that:

1. The division was a source of controversy in its mission and funding.

2. The division was an enriched program.

3. The division was the closest thing available in Washington to a system for initiating and testing ideas new to the District School System.

4. There was some question as to whether the division was one of demonstration or innovation.

5. There existed in the division an erratic evaluation of the quality of the program and a lack of ongoing research and evaluation programs.\(^\text{31}\)

Nickens, however, concluded that the Model School Division was handicapped by:

1. A lack of continuous funding which would enable it to build and plan programs.

2. A bureaucratic structure which did not lend itself to the need and desire to respond quickly to problems.

\(^{30}\)Cort, p. 238.

\(^{31}\)Passow, p. 381.
3. An absence of funding that was unencumbered by legal restrictions imposed by the District of Columbia and the Federal Government.

4. The absence of a mechanism for incorporating what was learned in the Model School Division by the rest of the System.

5. A general misunderstanding and distrust of the Model School Division, its goals and financing.

6. The School System's inability to accept a sectional, autonomous resource and development unit.

7. The System's lack of commitment to the idea of the Model School Division; to experimentation and innovation.32

Neither the "Innovation Team" nor the Model School Division was a panacea, and by no means solved all of the problems of the D.C. Public School System. They did, however, attempt to implement some of the recommendations first cited by Strayer, and later cited in the Passow Study, e.g., in-service training for teachers, staff development, community and parent involvement and improvement of general instruction. Regardless of the evaluations that were unfavorable, the Model School Division and the "Innovation Team" brought notable change to the School System.

32 Nickens, p. 60.
Late in 1961, a Panel on Educational Research and Development under the auspices of the President's Science Advisory Committee was formed to explore the contribution that research and development could make to education. In its report on March 1964 to the U.S. Commissioner of Education, the Director of the National Science Foundation and the Special Assistant to the President for Science and Technology Panel stated:

Educational reform can be sought in many ways. The technique emphasized by the Panel has two aspects. The first is the development of models, of something tangible to show what can be done—textbooks, films, teacher's guides... also the development of new kinds of schools and new programs of teacher education. The second aspect is the voluntary selective adoption of these models through local decisions by the components, numbering in the thousands, of the American School Systems... The very center of the Panel's concern, educational research and development, is, not merely an effort to get more education for the dollar. It is a reflection of the belief that our Society is evolving. Educational research and development is a mechanism to help the educational system adapt rapidly to new conditions. Reform must be continuous not only because successful research opens up further possibilities but also because a changing society means changing demands on the educational system. 33

The Anacostia Community Project was started in response to a mandate from the President of the United States, Lyndon B. Johnson.

In his March 1968 message to Congress, President Johnson said:

Washington's 150,000 school children and their parents... must also be able to exercise one of the most fundamental rights. They must have a voice which can be heard in the operation of their school system. 34

President Johnson spelled out the kind of school experiment he envisioned:

I propose a major model school experiment in the District, embracing a significant area of the city.

This program will:

1. Review the interest of citizens in their schools.

2. Help teachers improve the skills of their profession through retraining opportunities.

3. Bring the students the best in teaching methods and materials.

4. Revise the curriculum to make it serve the young people of our city.

5. Equip high school graduates with marketable skills.

6. Seek alliances between employers and the schools.

7. Give children the chance to learn at their pace, reducing both dropouts and failures.

8. Serve a section of the city where needs of students and schools are greatest.

---

9. To support this program I have included 10 million dollars in my 1969 budget for the Office of Education to supplement the funds providing regular support for the D.C. schools.35

The mandate did not specify the Anacostia neighborhood. An advisory panel of citizens and local and federal agency representatives recommended Anacostia to the Board of Education.

The board approved the plan on September 18, 1968, and the project was started in December 1968, under William Rice, area superintendent, and Evelyn Taylor, director of instruction.

The project was a unique one in that the community participated in the formulation of policies, the development of the program, and the selection of personnel. The project was also unique because its schools were governed by a local board and one area-wide board.

The instructional program of the project had unique features. The staff consisted of four reading supervisors who had worked for many years in the District of Columbia School System as classroom teachers, reading specialists, and in-service instructors. The reading supervisors were responsible for:

1. Teaching five in-service courses a day, three days a week in various schools during the regular school day to aides and teachers.

35Budget Message to Congress, Lyndon B. Johnson, President, p. 4.
2. Training community reading assistants.

3. Developing curriculum.

4. Organizing and supervising the extended day program, which was an after school project designed to teach reading skills through cooking, recreational reading, sewing, and do-it-yourself activities, and games.

The Anacostia Community Project was trying desperately to eradicate some of the ills of an area of the city which, for far too long, many thought had been the forgotten section of the city. However, after two years of implementing many of the recommendations that had been cited by Strayer and Passow; such as community involvement, in-service training for teachers and aides, paraprofessional and parental involvement, and an instructional program which was finally meeting the needs of the students in that area, a letter was sent from the Office of Education to the director of the project, stating that the project would be terminated because the venture had been unable to successfully document that it had made significant progress towards the fulfillment of its original objectives.

This letter came as a surprise to many involved in the project because students were improving in reading, and many parents were quite pleased with what they saw being done for their children. Because of the favorable publicity that the project was receiving in the area, the community and other concerned citizens worked very hard to save the project. Parents protested
and staged a demonstration at the Office of Education, but the project was terminated August, 1972.

Once again, an effort at educational reform by the District of Columbia School System had failed as far as many were concerned. However, the Anacostia Community Project came close to implementing many of the recommendations that were cited by the Strayer and Passow studies. For example, it addressed itself to:

1. Community involvement.
2. Rebuilding of instruction.
3. Use of paraprofessionals.
4. In-service training for teachers and aides.

Regardless of the reasons cited for the failure of the project such as, bureaucratic structure, and a lack of sophistication on the part of the community, many agreed with William Anderson, Executive Director of the Frederick Douglass Center, who stated:

"...If certain kinds of projects show signs of motivating Black people to think for themselves, far too often comes the arbitrary decision to cut them off, and since no project is perfect, they can always find an excuse to cut it off."

---

Academic Achievement Plan

The District School System experimented with many programs. Some were effective in specific areas of the city, but there still existed a need for better, more innovative programs, which would meet the needs of more students city-wide.

Kenneth Clark, a leading psychologist, presented a plan to the System, which he stated was designed to raise reading and mathematics scores in a year.

The plan offered many suggestions for achieving that goal:

1. Adequate professional training for teachers and executives.
2. Reading mobilization teams in each school.
3. Tutorial services.
5. Parental and community involvement.
6. University liaison.
7. Aide services.
8. Curriculum revision.\(^37\)

The plan was approved by the School Board on July 13, 1970. Before the plan could materialize, however, the Washington Teachers Union made known its opposition to the plan. This kept things in limbo for over a year.

Some of the objections to the plan were:

1. Teachers had not been involved in the planning.
2. Standardized tests were to be administered to pupils three times a year.

3. Differentiated staffing was designed to conform with university systems.
4. Pay differential based upon pupil performance was to be incorporated in the plan.\(^3\)\(^8\)

The objection made by the Teachers Union was not the only reason the plan was not implemented immediately. Kenneth Clark and the new Superintendent, Hugh Scott, were at odds over the plan. Dr. Clark charged that the Superintendent had abandoned his plan. The story was reported in the *Washington Post* as follows:

Psychologist Kenneth B. Clark said yesterday that Washington School Superintendent Hugh J. Scott has totally abandoned Clark’s Reading Mobilization Plan, which was adopted at a city Board Meeting in July . . .\(^3\)\(^9\)

During the period of the controversy, Kenneth Clark resigned as a paid consultant for the District of Columbia Public School System. However, there were parts of the plan that had been successfully implemented. Some areas that were successfully implemented are as follows:

1. Staff development programs were initiated in many of the schools.
2. Mobilization teams were formed in reading and mathematics in all of the schools and were operating quite successfully.


3. A four week leadership/management Institute was held during the summer and teachers and administrators worked together to develop and learn more about implementing other phases of the plan.\textsuperscript{40}

Whether this plan or any of the previously mentioned educational reform efforts in the District of Columbia School System have been lasting or successful is debatable. However, the efforts have been instrumental in bringing many issues to the forefront. Some of these issues are as follows:

1. That there are many forces within and without the system which impede reform action, budgetary, administrative, funding, and leadership problems.

2. That transition of leadership can create problems.

3. That piecemeal and isolated attempts at reform have no lasting effect on the educational system.

4. That community control is important, but not the main ingredient in educational reform.

\textsuperscript{40}Summary of the Superintendent Report to the Board of the Public Schools of the District of Columbia, Dr. Hugh Scott, Superintendent (Washington, D.C.: 1971), p. 9.
Recent Attempts at Educational Reform in Other Major Cities

Performance Contracting

During the time that the School System was having its problems with the Anacostia Community School Project, and the Academic Achievement Plan, a number of major school systems were experimenting with a unique concept in education, performance contracting.

A performance contract in education is a rather simple idea. Usually, the school system specifies certain outcomes, defines a target group of pupils, stipulates some of the conditions under which the instruction is to take place, and enters into a contract with an agency. Payment to the contractor is contingent on the achievement or performance of the pupils with respect to the specific outcomes. 41

While performance contracting has received a great deal of attention during the past few years, the idea is not entirely new. State-wide testing programs, common in many states during the 1920's and 1930's, had some characteristics of performance contracts. In many rural schools for instance, all eighth grade pupils were required to take state-wide tests in each of the school subjects. The tenure of an eighth grade teacher was contingent on

the performance of his pupils on the tests. Lennon stated that students at the University of Bologna in the fifteenth century required the professor to cover the entire book or to forfeit part of the funds due him. In other words, for centuries in education, people have been rewarded according to their performance, that is according to the effort they expend or the results they produce. The performance contracting as we know it today really came into existence because of discontentment with our educational system, and the government's struggle to improve procurement procedures.

On March 3, 1970 President Nixon presented his Educational Reform Message to Congress. He spoke of the responsibility of school administrators and teachers, and indicated that they should be held accountable for their performance. He said:

> What we have too often been doing is avoiding accountability for our local performance. We have, as a nation, too long avoided thinking of the productivity of schools. Ironic though it is, the avoidance of accountability is the single most serious threat to a continued and even more pluralistic education system.

Charles Blaschke proposed the performance contracting concept to the Texarkana School System in 1968, and the project began in October, 1969. The Texarkana contract specified a maximum payment of one hundred and

---

42 Campbell, p. 2.


thirty-five thousand dollars and stipulated that the Dorsett Educational System would receive eighty dollars for each student who achieved a one-grade level advance in a subject in eight hours of instruction. The contract was part of a five year, five million dollar "dropout prevention program" financed mainly by the U.S. Office of Education Title VIII and Title III funds.  

The Texarkana program received great publicity, both favorable and unfavorable. This program, however, has been the model for many later performance contracting programs.

While the large-scale, Federally financed program was in operation in Texarkana, the Portland, Oregon Public Schools were pioneering a different approach. Portland experimented with five very small, locally financed programs in reading. These programs are currently being evaluated and compared.  

During the 1969-70 school year, two school districts entered into performance contracts with educational firms, Texarkana and Portland. By the 1970-71 school year, at least one hundred programs had been started all over the country embodying the performance contracting concept, applied in a variety of ways in pursuit of a variety of educational objectives. One


variation might be the Competitive Partnership Reading Program, initiated in 1972 by Dr. James Guines, Associate Superintendent for Instruction, Washington, D.C. Public School System.
CHAPTER III

THE COMPETITIVE PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM IN READING IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TITLE I SCHOOLS

As stated in Chapter II, the District of Columbia School System had been thoroughly evaluated and scrutinized on two occasions, the Strayer Survey in 1948, and the Passow Study eighteen years later. Many recommendations and suggestions were made as a result of those studies. The records will show that the District has made an honest attempt on numerous occasions to follow many of the recommendations and suggestions. These include the Clark Plan, the Anacostia Community School Project, and the Model School Division. However, those who examine the records without the proper perspective may see the District School System as one which has been struggling for twenty-six years to improve the education of its youth and has been unsuccessful. However, if the records are examined carefully they will show that a great deal of progress has been made as a result of the numerous educational reform efforts.

This chapter will provide a description of the "Competitive Partnership Program," a recent attempt at educational reform in the District of Columbia Title I schools.
The Washington, D. C. School System has been made aware of its strengths and weaknesses and has constantly searched for other ways and methods to improve the academic achievement of the students in its schools. As proof of this, Dr. James Guines, Associate Superintendent for Instructional Services, introduced a new idea of instruction in the Title I Schools at about the same time that the Academic Achievement Plan was beginning to lose some of its effectiveness.

"Competitive Partnership," a new approach to quality education and accountability, as defined by Dr. Guines, is an instructional program in which major publishing companies compete with each other, but in partnership with a school system in tackling a specific educational problem.47

The Competitive Partnership Program was launched in the Title I elementary schools in the 1972-73 school year. ESEA Title I funds, however, have been allocated to many District of Columbia Schools since 1966. In 1966 seventy-one schools and 55,396 students were involved. In 1972-73 eighty schools and only 20,875 students were receiving Title I services.48

During the time that the Competitive Partnership Program was initiated in the Title I schools, the Title I program had gone through major transformations. Its main goal, nevertheless, was still to improve the


academic achievement of the identified student population.

The reading achievement goal for Title I students during the 1972-73 school year was one grade, one month growth in achievement scores in reading for a ten month school year.

The rationale for instituting the Competitive Partnership Program in Reading for Title I schools was based on several educational and administrative assumptions.

1. Highly structured reading programs are essential to successful performance and progress with slow learners and/or educationally disadvantaged youngsters who represent Title I target population.

2. Performance contracting has demonstrated that it has not produced satisfactory results and has been very costly.

3. Under competitive partnership no more money, and in some cases considerably less money, can be spent for services that relate to a specific task.

4. Many teachers who have been trained in traditional teachers colleges and universities need additional support programs and in-service training to successfully perform in urban schools.

5. Each company and each teacher competes with other companies and other teachers to produce the desired results.\(^49\)


In Washington, D.C., the competitive partnership concept resulted in a project involving the curriculum area of elementary reading in eighty Title I
schools. There were five steps to the project:

1. Assessment of student performance.
2. Establishment of clearly defined objectives stated in behavioral terms.
3. Selection of materials correlated to the objectives.
4. Implementation of competitive partnership and planned variation.
5. Evaluation of results.\(^{50}\)

Assessment of Student Performance

In the District schools there were many pupils whose performance in reading was poor. The target school population selected for the competitive partnership program was comprised of Title I students in kindergarten, first, second and third grades, whose test scores on the city-wide tests placed them at or below the fiftieth percentile, and students who were repeating a grade, regardless of their test scores.

Establishment of Clearly Defined Objectives
Stated in Behavioral Terms

Objectives related to the specific needs of the student population were formulated and stated in behavioral terms. These objectives and goals served several purposes. They were guides by which to measure student

\(^{50}\)Guines, p. 2.
performance. They made clear to students, teachers, and parents what the school was striving for in its instructional program. And, finally, they provided the framework by which Washington could deal with publishers. The publishers were made to see what their respective capacities were in helping teachers and students.

Selection of Materials Correlated to the Objectives

Published materials were examined to determine those that seemed to meet the criteria. Then several publishers were invited to meet with the school administrative staff to determine each company's interest in, and capacity for, taking on an educational challenge in partnership with the school, and in competition with other publishers. The school administrators outlined for the publishers, the objectives of the project, the criteria to be used, the characteristics of the target groups, and other pertinent data.

From these meetings each publisher was invited to write a proposal outlining materials to be used, plans for staff development, community involvement activities, and overall project management. High priority was put on the services aspect of the proposal, especially as they related to staff development. For some time it had been realized that many teacher training institutions no longer seemed able to prepare and improve the teacher's capacity to be successful with urban children. It seemed that often the
university in-service courses were totally irrelevant in terms of giving teachers the specific kinds of skills they need to teach reading effectively to the urban child.

Teachers and administrators attended orientation sessions conducted by the publishers, and participated in the selection process. As a result three publishers, D. C. Heath and Company, McGraw-Hill, and Random House/Singer were chosen to participate in the Competitive Partnership Program, with the understanding that the program which raised the reading levels the highest within three years, would be the program adopted for the system.

D. C. Heath - Miami
Linguistics

Origin

The Miami Linguistics Readers were developed as an aspect of a Ford Foundation grant to the Dade County (Miami, Florida) Public Schools. The objective of the proposal was to provide a "breakthrough" on the problem of teaching reading and the language arts to children who were learning English as a second language.

The rationale for the Miami Linguistic Readers was:

1. to develop books which were "culture free" and which would have themes with which children of any background could relate.
2. to develop books which would provide an approach to
   English with the least amount of phonemic irregularity—
   this being necessary, especially for children who
   already had some knowledge of a relatively-regular
   phonemic language: Cuban-Spanish. 51

Materials and Method

The Miami Linguistic Reader is a linguistic-oriented Language Arts
Program, with materials that are strongly influenced by structural linguistics.
The program involves the learning of the sounds of the language, with special
emphasis on speaking and listening. The complete program consists of
twenty-one small paperback booklets, sixteen seatwork booklets and a
teacher's manual to accompany each book. The books in the program have
stories developed with a limited vocabulary which is phased in accordance
with some selected linguistic-phonemic principles.

Throughout the program there are activities which involve listening,
speaking, writing, spelling and reading. The focus of the language activities
is on patterns of language developed through drill. Much of the patterning
is with prepositional phrases, which can be learned through a regular recurring
pattern of phrases. An example is as follows:

Show the pupils Chart I and tell them the rat's name is Nat. Guide them in asking, "Is that (Kid Kit)?" and in answering, "No, it isn't, It's Nat the Rat," and "Yes, it is, It's Nat the Rat." 52

Much of the speaking and reading is dependent upon imitation of the teacher's model, with whole word sight reading as the first step. In that matter it is assumed that the structure will be learned. This structuring comes under the heading of language rather than reading. An example is as follows:

Teacher: (pointing to Nat on Chart I) "Is that Kid Kit?"
Group I: "Is that Kid Kit?" (repeat in unison)
Teacher: "No, it isn't. It's Nat the Rat." 53

Other components of the program were:

Edge (Early Development Growth Experiences).--This provided a program which allowed each child to master initial skills at his own pace.

Mini Systems.--This reinforced and supplemented the on-going developmental reading program. Critical spelling skills were developed along with reading skills which assisted pupils in learning both decoding and encoding.

Listening Kits.--This stresses skills critical to the mastery of reading comprehension and related language arts skills: word recognition, listening, vocabulary, written communication and spelling. 54

52 Aukerman, p. 214.
53 Ibid., p. 214.
There were thirty-two Title I schools using the Miami Linguistic Readers in grades kindergarten through grade three during the 1972-1973 school year.

McGraw-Hill Programmed Reading

Origin

McGraw-Hill Programmed Reading is a linguistic-phonemic approach which grew out of the work of two individuals who became especially interested in the possibilities of programmed instruction. The major author, Cynthia Buchanan, had been associated with some of the programming which had taken place at Harvard in the 1950's when she was working on her master's degree there. Her undergraduate work was done at Hollin's College where she met the other author, Dr. M. W. Sullivan, who was then head of the Modern Language Department. Their first attempt at programming reading was unsuccessful. However, after many revisions the linguistics program was rewritten in a programmed sequence for printing in booklet form. By 1961 it was decided that the materials had been refined adequately, and the authors had the program published.\(^\text{55}\)

Materials and Method

The McGraw-Hill Reading Program consists of a sequence of workbooks in which the child is required to write his responses rather than just

\(^{55}\)Aukerman, p. 189.
check his choices. Thus, by writing letters and words as part of the process, it is hoped that the child reinforces "reading."

The readiness program is not programmed, but is a function of the entire class, working with the teacher on letter symbols and their related sounds.

There are three Series in this program.

Series I of the program consists of seven expendable workbooks in which the five short vowel sounds are presented. This work is followed with extensive work on consonants. There are over five-thousand "frames," each requiring a response, in the seven workbooks.

Series II consists of seven workbooks, two story books, and a test booklet. Testing takes place after every fifty frames of learning materials.

Series III embraces several books, including a wide variety of material, such as poems, plays, short stories, and selections about gods and heroes of Greek Mythology. 56

In this program four different responses are called for. In two frames the child is expected to complete a word by adding a missing letter. In one frame he responds by choosing one of two phrases. In another frame he makes a "yes" or "no" response, and in the last frame he marks a picture to represent a phrase.

56 Aukerman, p. 189.
The answers are given in the panel on the left side of the page. The child is provided with a slider with which he covers the answers. When he has written his responses he reveals the answer by pulling the slider down to the black line containing the answer. Thus he finds out immediately whether he was right or wrong.57

The complete program consisted of two kits—one readiness, and one pre-reading; twenty-one developmental programmed readers, arranged in three series, and accompanying Webster masters; filmstrips, tapes, and storybooks.

Approximately five-thousand children used the program in grades kindergarten through three during the 1972-1973 school year.

Random House Reading Program

Origin

The Structural Reading Series, published by L. W. Singer Co., and copyrighted in 1963, was developed by Dr. Catherine Stern, Margaret Stern, and Toni Gould between the years 1944 and 1951, while they were operating an experimental school for five-year olds in New York City. The Structural reading approach at the Castle School, as it was called, now appears as a series of phonemics-reading workbooks.58

57 Nila Banton Smith and Ruth Strickland, Some Approaches to Reading (Association for Education), p. 22.

58 Aukerman, p. 134.
Materials and Method

The Structural Reading Series is a developmental reading program, that uses a modified linguistic approach. The skills of reading, writing, and spelling are presented as integral parts of the learning process, centered around the spoken language.

The first part of the program stresses readiness. Children learn to recognize the initial sounds they hear in familiar words. At the same time, they learn to recognize the graphemes which are used to represent those sounds.

The First Grade program that follows the readiness training consists of two workbooks. Throughout the program, the first emphasis is upon listening to the spoken sounds and analyzing them in the spoken words. Throughout the First Grade program the child is expected to utilize his structural analysis skills in all his reading. Content clues are also utilized, but not as word attack skills.

The program eliminated all sounds in isolation. In contrast to the sight method so often found in basal readers, the Structural Reading Series provides the child with some phonemic-generalities which may be used in aiding him to recognize words. As the child progresses through the structure of the program, he is not only building a firm basis for a sight vocabulary, but has the opportunity for using that vocabulary immediately in a self-contained reading sequence.
The program places its major emphasis on the importance of the child's own discoveries in learning to read. The readiness program emphasizes the teaching of sound-letter relationships, progresses to a decoding level; and advances to a level of reading which provides for the development of critical reading skills in grades two and three. 59

The Criterion Reading Component of the Random House Reading Program is an assessment and learning management system structured to suit the individual needs of the pupils.

Other components of the program were:

Reading Readiness Skillstarters.—A set of games designed to teach basic sight vocabulary.

Read On.—A set of sixty Criterion Tests on cassette tapes designed to assess a pupils skills in five critical reading areas.

Sights and Sounds.—A kit of sixty-six favorite children's books with corresponding recordings, which coordinates the written and spoken word. It can be used with students in kindergarten through third grade.

Random House Reading Orange.—A program built around fifty high interest childrens books grouped into five reading levels to develop comprehensive and vocabulary skills.

The three programs used in the Competitive Partnership Reading Program may have some similarities in that they all claim to have incorporated principles of linguistics. Yet, in many other ways they are quite different.

59Aukerman, p. 137.
Random House and Miami Linguistics seem to emphasize patterns of speech, vocal habits, systems of sound symbols, and speaking and listening, whereas, McGraw-Hill, on the other hand, seems to stress word-identification. Miami Linguistics and McGraw-Hill seem to place a great deal of stress on repetition per se, whereas, Random House does not.

Few studies have been conducted to determine the superiority of one set of materials over another, however, it is the aim of the investigator of this study to determine if either of the three programs used in the Competitive Partnership Reading Program was significantly superior over the other two in raising the reading scores of second and third grade Title I students.

Implementation of Competitive Partnership

When the Competitive Partnership was introduced in Washington, D.C. as an idea to increase student achievement, the Title I Schools were operating Total Learning Centers. The Total Learning Center concept was designed to incorporate an abundance of services, resources, and activities toward the common goal of significantly raising achievement levels of students while, at the same time, producing well-rounded individuals.
Personnel and Services

Some of the personnel and services which were required to implement the Competitive Partnership Program effectively were: Executive Director, Assistant for Administration, Assistant for Instruction, Assistant for Aides and Paraprofessionals, Task Forces, Title I Reading Resource Teachers, Educational Aides, Program Assistants, Pupil Personnel Services, Consultants, Parent Advisory Council, Local Parent Advisory, Parent-Partnership Volunteer Corps, Staff Development, Cultural Enrichment, and State and Local Education Agencies.

Executive Director

The Executive Director assumed responsibility for the overall administration and direction of the program and its progress towards attaining the goal.

Assistant for Administration

The Assistant for Administration provided management support and services to all Title I schools, developed and directed procedures for purchasing and distributing materials and supplies, and participated in the development and coordination of the testing program.
Assistant for Instruction

The Assistant for Instruction provided leadership and assistance to all resource personnel, maintained general coordination of the instructional programs, and developed and directed a comprehensive program of staff development.

Assistant for Aides and Paraprofessionals

The Assistant for Aides and Paraprofessionals coordinated the paraprofessional program, provided in-service training for aides, and interpreted the role of paraprofessionals to local school communities.

Task Forces

Members of the Title I Staff were divided into three task forces, one for each reading program participating in the Competitive Partnership Program. The members accomplished the following tasks:

1. Learned the operations of the program.

2. Worked with the company representatives to order and disseminate materials to schools.

3. Worked with consultants to schedule area workshops and individual visitations.
Title I Reading Resource Teachers

One important part of the program was the Title I reading teachers. They were assigned to all Title I Schools and worked only with grades kindergarten through three. They were responsible for:

1. Identifying the specific needs of teachers, including instructional materials and personal needs.
2. Assisting in the diagnoses of learning difficulties, and in the administration of diagnostic instruments.
3. Arranging for demonstration lessons for individual teachers or small groups.
4. Directing and/or arranging workshops.
5. Acquiring consultants or other resource assistance to provide specialized help when needed.
6. Working with small groups of children in varied activities to develop, extend or reinforce the basic skills in reading.

Educational Aides

Educational aides were assigned to all Title I Schools. Some of their responsibilities were:

1. Collecting and distributing instructional materials and supplies.
2. Correcting and scoring objective tests.

3. Preparing bulletin boards.

4. Supervising small group activities.

5. Maintaining records.

6. Assisting the classroom teacher in the implementation of the competitive partnership program.

Program Assistant

The Program Assistant served as a general resource assistant to classroom teachers, providing a variety of services related to the organization, instruction and management of services at the local school level. Some of the specific tasks performed were:

1. Assisting with in-service training activities.

2. Acquiring substitutes for teachers attending workshops.

3. Helping with organizing materials for a workshop.

4. Checking invoices of materials and supplies on hand and those incoming.

5. Keeping accurate records related to materials.

6. Collecting and filling orders for materials.

7. Making arrangements for trips.

8. Acquiring bus services and chaperones.
Pupil Personnel Services

The Pupil Personnel Title I staff provided support to the program through a range of services focusing on the child at home, in school, and in the community at large. The staff consisted of a pupil personnel worker, aide, clinical psychologist, a psychiatric social worker, and a speech therapist.

Consultants

Consultants from each publishing company met with the task force members and planned workshops for teachers.

The first workshop was for four days. During that period consultants explained the rationale, goals, and component parts of the program to teachers and administrators, and taught mini-lessons.

Consultants also met regularly with the task force members and scheduled visitations days to meet with all teachers using the programs. Monitoring systems, evaluation forms, and guidelines were designed by consultants to help implement the Competitive Partnership Program.

Parent Advisory Council

The Parent Advisory Council was the official advisory body for the Title I Program. The Council reviewed and submitted the Title I Proposal to the Superintendent of schools, for action by the Board of Education.
Local Parent Advisory Council

Each local school unit has a Parent Advisory Council established to determine priority of needs, and to make recommendations to the city-wide Council for their implementation.

Parent-Partnership Volunteer Corps

The Parent-Partners Corps was a strategy for broadening the teaching base by drawing parents into the educational program in positive and practical ways. Parent-Partners assisted students and teachers in each school. The parents received a stipend as an indication that their services were valued. Training for parents included activities to help parents gain skills to use in the classroom as well as in the home. (See appendix G.)

Staff Development

The Staff Development component was an on-going program of pre- and in-service activities for all personnel. Its overall purpose was to provide staff members, aides, teachers and parents with the knowledge, attitudes and skills needed to effectively help children achieve success in learning.

The activities included seminars, pre-service workshops, and in-service courses for teachers and aides.

The in-service courses were held after school in different schools throughout the city. Teachers and aides received credit for enrolling in the
courses and course credit was provided through D.C. Teacher's College. Many teachers and aides took advantage of this service.

**Cultural Enrichment**

This program was designed to expand and extend the students experiential background and to help them gain additional reinforcements in reading through music, drama, the fine arts, Black studies, and field trip experiences. Most Title I students went to several cultural affairs during the school year, and participated in a variety of cultural activities during the summer school term as well.

**State and Local Education Agencies**

The local administrative staff was the main body which was concerned with the success of the Competitive Partnership Reading Program. However, the State and Local Education Agency was the body which concerned itself with observing and evaluating the Competitive Partnership Program, which was using Title I funds.

The Education Agencies which include federal and local Title I personnel visited Title I schools frequently to observe teachers, students, and the operations of the program to determine if Title I students were receiving regular services as well as services provided by Title I funds. A comprehensive evaluation was done to determine if schools were supplanting
Title I funds. If supplanting was discovered the schools were cited and Title I funds were withdrawn. Therefore, schools were careful not to violate the Title I guidelines.

**Evaluation of Results**

Comprehensive and objective evaluations were conducted. The individual publisher, in partnership with the schools, conducted continuous informal testing and other types of periodic evaluations. The California Achievement Test was administered to second graders and the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills was administered to third graders annually. It is proposed that after three years the findings will be examined by a non-school professional evaluator to see which program has significantly raised reading levels of Title I students and would be the program used city-wide.

Many of the models which have been developed to educate urban children have been ill-conceived and implemented. However, it is hoped that the Competitive Partnership and the Total Learning concept are viable models for bringing about major improvement in the academic achievement of Title I students.

Some elements that were included in the Competitive Partnership Program, which may insure its success are:

1. A structured parent involvement program.

2. A structured cultural enrichment program.
3. An on-going staff development program.

4. An effective diagnostic-prescriptive program.

5. An effective pupil-personnel component.

6. A structured community involvement program.
CHAPTER IV
DESIGN AND PROCEDURES

Chapter III described the rationale, elements and the implementation of the "Competitive Partnership Reading Program," the most recent attempt at educational reform initiated in the District of Columbia Public School System.

This chapter will provide a description of the population, method of data collection, the instruments, and the method for analyzing the data.

The review of the literature on educational reform efforts in the District has underscored the need for a study investigating the influence of the Competitive Partnership Program in reading and parent involvement on the academic achievement of Title I students over a one year period.

This study was designed in three parts to determine if the Competitive Partnership Program and parent involvement would produce measurably different results in composite reading scores of Title I students in grades two and three. Answers to the following questions were sought:

1. Was there a significant difference in mean reading scores when scores made before the program were compared with scores made after one year of participation in the Competitive Partnership Program?
2. Which of the three programs produced a significant difference in mean reading scores of second and third grade Title I students?

3. Was there a significant difference in mean reading scores of second and third grade Title I students when scores made by students who attended schools with highly active parent involvement were compared with scores made by students who attended schools with low parent involvement?

**Statement of Hypotheses**

**Hypothesis I**

There will be no significant difference in composite reading scores of Title I students when scores made while the students were in the second grade during 1971-1972 were compared with scores the students made when they were in the third grade during 1972-1973, which was the first year of the Competitive Partnership Program.

**Hypothesis II**

There will be no significant difference in composite reading scores of second and third grade Title I students attending schools using any one of the three Competitive Partnership Programs.

**Hypothesis III**

There will be no significant relationship between scores made in reading by second and third grade Title I students who attended schools with highly active or low parent involvement.
Description of Instruments and Collection of Data

Measure of Achievement

The instruments used by the System for the purpose of testing reading achievement are the California Achievement Tests for grade two, and the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills for grade three.

California Achievement Tests-1957 Edition

This test reports two scores in each of the three basic skill areas of reading, arithmetic, and language.

The 1957 edition of the California Achievement Tests is the latest revision of an achievement test series which started in 1934. Although items in respect to content areas are included, scores are not obtainable for different content areas. The content validity of these tests for a school system must be assessed in light of the instructional objectives of that system.

The reported reliabilities for the total reading, total arithmetic, and total language scores are satisfactory, in general falling in the range of .86 to .96. Reliability coefficients were computed using Kuder-Richardson formula 21 on the six principal tests of the California Achievement Tests.

Validity data are given in the 1957 Technical Report in terms of correlations with other test scores, item analysis statistics and other criteria.
The most recent norming of these tests took place in 1963. The tests were administered concurrently with the 1963 S-Form of the California Short-Form Test of Mental Maturity, to over 15,000 students, the number per grade ranging from 968 to 1481. It is reported that the students were from (1) independent class units from seven geographic regions representing forty-nine states and, (2) complete school systems, including all students in grades one through twelve from five school systems located in the northeastern, eastern, central, and western areas of the United States.  

**Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills—1968-1970**

This reading test is designed for students from second grade through the twelfth grade. This instrument is a group survey test, which yields three scores, vocabulary, comprehension, and a total score.

As the title implies, the test is designed to measure basic skills as distinct from "higher mental processes." The very high correlations reported in the Technical Report between this reading test and the reading subtest of the California Achievement Tests, and also with the California Test of Mental Maturity—Short Form indicate that the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills reading test may not be measuring merely low level skills. Indeed,

---

the correlation coefficients ranging from .82 to .92 between the total reading scores of the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills and the California Achievement Test suggest that they are measuring essentially the same thing.

Separate norms are provided for public and Catholic schools and also for large cities. Minority groups are proportionately represented in these norms.

From a technical point of view, the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills reading test is a model of good test construction. Norms are based upon an exceedingly large standardization sample of representative students. Kuder-Richardson formula 20 reliabilities at each grade level for vocabulary, comprehension, and total scores are almost all above .90, with standard errors of the measurement ranging from .25 to 1.01 (in grade equivalent units). Interform reliability coefficients tend to be in the high .80's for the total reading score. 61

Survey of Parents and School Personnel

Two questionnaires were designed and distributed by mail to one-hundred school personnel and sixty parents to elicit attitudes and specific information about the Competitive Partnership Program.

61 Buros, pp. 685-686.
Questionnaire Construction

In constructing the questionnaires, consideration was given to the significance, clarity and simplicity of responses. The questionnaires were precoded with the intent of using tabulating computer cards. Questions on the questionnaires were constructed to obtain "yes" or "no" answers, as well as completions. The following questions were used as criteria to validate the items on the questionnaires: (1) do the questions get at something testable? (2) is the information consistent?, and (3) do the questions elicit accurate data?

Procedure

Subjects of the Study

As previously stated, this study is designed in three parts. In part one the subjects include those students who were in grade two one year before the Competitive Partnership Program and who became third graders the first year of the Program, part two includes those students in grades two and three who participated in the Competitive Partnership Program the first year (October 1972-May 1973), part three includes students from ten Title I schools classified as having either highly active or low parent involvement.
Those schools returning questionnaires represented: (a) a cross section of the city, (2) large enrollments, and (3) fell within the upper half of the ranking for Title I eligibility.

The criterion data used by the District of Columbia to determine eligibility and rank are:

1. The percentage of children per school whose families were receiving Aid to Families with Dependent Children.

2. The percentage of children per school who were on free lunches.

3. The percentage of children per school who were living in public housing.

The population of this investigation includes educational personnel, parents and students of the District of Columbia forty-six elementary public schools, who participated in the Title I Competitive Partnership Reading Program during 1972-1973.

1. Educational personnel--Classroom teachers, reading specialist, reading resource teachers, and educational aides who were responsible for the instructional component of the program.

2. Students--Second and third grade Title I students.

3. Parents--Those adults who are responsible for the Title I students at home.
The Competitive Partnership Program was designed so that each student in grades Kindergarten through three would receive sixty to ninety minutes of reading instruction a day, using one of the three selected programs. (see Chapter III.)

During the first year of the program the investigator visited classrooms and consulted with teachers. Questions were answered, and workshops and demonstrations were conducted to clarify procedures.

The goal set for the year for Title I students was one year, one month growth for ten months of instruction.

Design of the Study

Most of this study is a Time-Series Repeated Measurement Design. It is a Time-Series Repeated Measurement Design because it analyzes data plotted over time. It consists of taking a series of evaluations and then introducing a variable into the system after which another series of evaluations is made. If a substantial change results in the second series of evaluations, we may assume with reasonable experimental logic that the cause of the difference in observational results was because of the factor introduced into the system. 62

The reading scores used for this study consisted of a combination of the two reading scores made on the California Achievement Tests by second

grade students and the total reading score made by third grade students on
the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills.

The mean reading scores of the total second and third grade Title I population were computed by grades, and the t-test was used to test for statistical significance of differences in 1971-72 and 1972-73.

The mean reading scores of the second and third grade Title I population using each of the three Competitive Partnership programs were computed by grades, and the t-test was used to test for statistical significance among the programs, and the .05 level of confidence was designated as the level which would be used to determine significance.

An item analysis was made of the parents and school personnel questionnaires to determine the differences in item responses and the percentages of differences. Specific responses on the questionnaires were analyzed to determine high or low parental involvement and to determine if either had a significant relationship to reading scores.

---

CHAPTER V

ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS OF THE DATA

Chapter IV provided a description of the population method of data collection, instruments, and the methods for analyzing the data.

This chapter will provide the findings of the study, which will lead to the support or rejection of the hypotheses as stated.

This chapter is divided into three parts. The first part includes an analysis of the data derived from a comparison of test scores of those students who were in grade two during 1971, and who became third graders during October, 1972 to May, 1973, which was the first school year of the Competitive Partnership Program. The second part includes an analysis of the data derived from a comparison of test scores of those second and third graders using the three Competitive Partnership Programs during October, 1972 to May, 1973. The third part includes an analysis of data derived from a comparison of test scores of those second and third graders who attended schools classified as having either highly active or low parental involvement.
Part I

Hypothesis I  There will be no significant difference in composite reading scores of Title I students when scores made while the students were in the second grade during 1971-1972 were compared with scores the students made when they were in the third grade during 1972-1973, which was the first year of the Competitive Partnership Program.

In order to test the first hypothesis, the investigator compared the mean reading score made by second graders on the California Achievement Tests between September, 1971 and October, 1972 with the mean score made by those same students as third graders on the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills between October, 1972 and May, 1973.

The investigator used scores from two different tests and over two differing time periods, because prior to the Competitive Partnership Program, the policy of the District was to test students only in September, therefore, no end of the year scores were available before 1973.

It is assumed that scores derived from the same test instead of two different tests would be more valid and reliable. However, Buros stated that the correlation coefficients ranging from .82 to .92 between the total reading scores of the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills and The California Achievement Test suggest that they are measuring essentially the same thing.

---

64 Buros, pp. 685-686.
The findings as presented in Table I indicate that the mean score made by second grade students at the beginning of the school term was 1.5 and the mean score made by these same students at the beginning of the next year when they became third graders was 2.4, which indicated that there was an improvement of .9. However, the score made was significant at the .01 level. Thus, these students made scores which were highly significant one year before the Competitive Partnership Program.

The mean score made by these same students at the beginning of the third grade was 2.4 as previously stated, however, at the end of the third grade the mean score was 3.1. This indicated that there was an improvement of .7. Even though the improvement was less than those made the year before the program the score was significant at the .01 level. Since the scores made one year before the program were as significant as the scores made after one year of the program hypothesis I is accepted.

Even though hypothesis I is accepted, this does not imply that the Competitive Partnership program was unsuccessful, however the following limitations which may or may not have influenced the outcome are listed:

1. The use of test scores from two different tests, even though the correlation co-efficients of from .82 to .92 between the two suggest that they are measuring the same thing.
2. The fact that students received instruction for a year during 1971-72 before they were tested, whereas, they received instruction for eight months during the first year of the Competitive Partnership Program before being tested.

3. The fact that teachers during 1971-72 were using materials they were familiar with, while during 1972-73 teachers had to get used to new programs, which may have resulted in students not getting eight months of instruction which was comparable to eight or ten months of instruction in a previous year.
TABLE I

MEAN WEIGHTED SCORES
COMPARISON BETWEEN MEAN SCORES OF
TITLE I STUDENTS DURING SECOND
AND THIRD GRADE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRADE</th>
<th>YEAR MONTH</th>
<th>MEAN SCORE</th>
<th>STANDARD DEVIATION</th>
<th>T-TEST VALUE</th>
<th>SIGNIFICANT LEVEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>Sept. 1971</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oct. 1972</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>Oct. 1972</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May 1973</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N–44
df–43

Significant at the .05 level of confidence or higher.
Part II

Hypothesis II

There will be no significant difference in composite reading scores of second and third grade Title I students attending schools using any one of the three Competitive Partnership Programs.

Records were examined to identify schools which were using only one of the three Competitive Partnership Programs. It was discovered that most of the Title I schools were using more than one program at each grade level. This came about because at the beginning of the program teachers were allowed to select the program they wanted to use in their individual classrooms. Therefore, Tables II and III represent a small part of the total population.

At the second grade level ten schools were using program A (D. C. Heath) exclusively, involving approximately three hundred students. Fourteen schools were using program B (McGraw-Hill), involving approximately four hundred students and three schools were using program C (Random House), involving approximately ninety students.

At the third grade level eleven schools were using program A exclusively, involving approximately three hundred and thirty students. Eleven schools were using program B, involving three hundred and thirty students and five were using program C, involving approximately one hundred and fifty students.
In order to test the first part of the second hypothesis, as it related to second graders the investigator used the mean reading scores made by second graders on the California Achievement Test between October, 1972 and May, 1973.

The t-test was used to determine the level of significance for the reading scores of second grade students who used the three programs, A, B, and C during one year of the Competitive Partnership Program, and to determine whether there was a significant difference in reading scores of students using any one of the three Competitive Partnership Programs.

The findings as presented in Table II indicate that the reading scores made by second grade students who used the three programs were significant at the .05 level or higher. However, the scores for those students who used programs A and B were significant at the .01 level of confidence, whereas, the scores made by those students who used program C were significant at the .05 level. Thus, hypothesis II as it concerns second graders of this study is accepted.

In order to test the second hypothesis, as it related to third graders the investigator used the mean scores made by third graders on the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills between October, 1972 and May, 1973.

The t-test was used to determine the level of significance for the scores of third grade students who used the three programs A, B, and C during one year of the Competitive Partnership Program, and to determine
**TABLE II**

**MEAN WEIGHTED SCORES**
**COMPARISON BETWEEN MEAN SCORES OF**
**SECOND GRADE TITLE I STUDENTS USING**
**THE THREE COMPETITIVE PARTNERSHIP**
**READING PROGRAMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM</th>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>MEAN SCORE</th>
<th>STANDARD DEVIATION</th>
<th>T-TEST VALUE</th>
<th>SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Oct.</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>8.88</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-10</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df-9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Oct.</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>11.42</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-14</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df-13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Oct.</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-3</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant at the .05 level of confidence or higher.
whether there was a significant difference in reading scores of students using any one of the three Competitive Partnership Programs.

The findings as presented in Table III indicate that the reading scores made by third grade students who used the three reading programs were significant at the .01 level or higher. Therefore, there is no significant difference in reading scores of third grade students using any one of the three Competitive Partnership Programs. Thus, hypothesis II as it concerns third graders of this study is accepted.

Hypothesis II is accepted for second and third graders, however, the following limitations which may or may not have influenced the outcome are listed:

1. The fact that teachers were using programs that they were not familiar with.
2. The fact that students started the programs late and only received eight months of instruction before they were tested.
3. The fact that the three programs are similar in that they all claim to be "linguistically" oriented, or stress language development.
4. The fact that Title I students have severe reading problems in most instances and are not expected to make phenomenal gains in eight months regardless of the methods or programs
used. The goal for Title I is one year one month gain for one year of instruction. Thus, if the students made from seven months to nine months over an eight month period of time, this is about their rate of achievement.
TABLE III
MEAN WEIGHTED SCORES
COMPARISON BETWEEN MEAN SCORES OF
THIRD GRADE TITLE I STUDENTS USING
THE THREE COMPETITIVE PARTNERSHIP
READING PROGRAMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM</th>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>MEAN SCORE</th>
<th>STANDARD DEVIATION</th>
<th>T-TEST VALUE</th>
<th>SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Oct. 1972</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>13.33</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-11</td>
<td>May 1973</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df-10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Oct. 1972</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-11</td>
<td>May 1973</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df-10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Oct. 1972</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-5</td>
<td>May 1973</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df-4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant at the .05 level of confidence or higher.
Part III

Hypothesis III There will be no significant relationship between scores made in reading by second and third grade Title I students who attended schools with highly active or low parent involvement.

All Title I schools have a parental involvement component. Many have parents who are highly active in the program, and many schools have parents who are not. In the Competitive Partnership Program provisions are made for parents to attend regularly scheduled workshops and training sessions, visit other schools, assist classroom teachers, attend conferences and meetings, and to work as tutors.

To establish which schools had parents who were highly active and those who were not, the investigator analyzed the questionnaires returned by educational personnel and parents stating whether parents were involved and how. (see appendix F.)

One hundred seventy-five questionnaires were sent to educational personnel. One hundred were returned. Basically ten different schools returned a sufficient number to be included in this study.

From the answers school personnel stated on the questionnaires relative to parent involvement, (questions 13 and 14), seven schools out of the ten showed highly active parental involvement and three were classified as having low parental involvement.
Educational Personnel: (see appendix F)

Question 13 - Are parents involved in the program?

Seven schools had educational personnel who stated "yes." Three schools stated "no."

Question 14 - If the answer to question 13 is yes, state how.

The majority of educational personnel from the seven highly active schools stated that parents served as tutors, assisted classroom teachers, attended workshops and training sessions and went to conferences.

Parents: (see appendix F)

Of the one hundred twenty questionnaires sent to parents, fifty were returned. From the answers parents stated on the questionnaires relative to parental involvement, (questions 5-10) from the seven schools that were classified as highly active, the investigator secured the following data:

Questions 5 and 6 - Did you help in the planning and/or selection of the program? If yes, state how.

The majority of the parents stated that they had no active part in planning the program, but many stated that they had a part in the selection.
Question 7 - How are you involved in the program now?

Parents from the schools classified as having highly active parent involvement stated that they served as tutors, classroom assistants, attended workshops and training sessions.

Questions 8 and 9 - What office do you or your friends hold?

Parents from the seven schools stated that they were delegates to the City-wide meetings.

Question 10 - How many meetings have you attended?

The majority of parents who were actively involved stated that they had attended four to seven meetings.

In order to test the first part of the third hypothesis, the investigator secured the mean reading scores made on the California Achievement Test by second grade students between October, 1972 and May, 1973. From those scores, the scores of second grade students from the seven schools that were classified as highly active and the three schools that were classified as low were compared to see if there was a significant difference.

The t-test was used to determine the level of significance for the scores of the second grade students, who attended the seven schools with highly active parent involvement and those who attended the three schools with low parent involvement.

The findings as presented in Table IV indicate that those second graders who attended schools with highly active parent involvement made
TABLE IV

MEAN WEIGHTED SCORES
COMPARISON BETWEEN MEAN SCORES OF SECOND GRADE
TITLE I STUDENTS WHO ATTENDED SCHOOLS WITH
HIGHLY ACTIVE OR LOW PARENT INVOLVEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>MONTH YEAR</th>
<th>MEAN SCORE</th>
<th>STANDARD DEVIATION</th>
<th>T-TEST VALUE</th>
<th>SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Oct. 1972</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>27.50</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>df-6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Oct. 1972</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>df-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant at the .05 level of confidence or higher.
scores after eight months which were significant at the .01 level, and those students who attended schools with low parent involvement made scores after eight months of instruction which were not significant. Therefore, the third hypothesis as it relates to second graders is rejected.

In order to test the second part of the third hypothesis, the investigator secured the mean reading scores made on the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills by third grade students between October, 1972 and May, 1973. From those scores, the scores of the third grade students from the seven schools that were classified as highly active and those three schools that were classified as low were compared to see if there was a significant difference.

The t-test was used to determine the level of significance for the scores of the third grade students, who attended the seven schools with highly active parent involvement and those who attended the three schools with low parent involvement.

The findings as presented in Table V indicate that those third graders who attended schools with highly active parent involvement made scores after eight months which were significant at the .01 level, and those students who attended schools with low parent involvement made scores after eight months of instruction which were not significant. Therefore, hypotheses III as it relates to third grade students is rejected.
## TABLE V

Mean Weighted Scores
Comparison Between Mean Scores of Third Grade Title I Students Who Attended Schools with Highly Active or Low Parent Involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>MONTH YEAR</th>
<th>MEAN SCORE</th>
<th>STANDARD DEVIATION</th>
<th>T-TEST VALUE</th>
<th>SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High N-7 df-6</td>
<td>Oct. 1972</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May 1973</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low N-3 df-2</td>
<td>Oct. 1972</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May 1973</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant at the .05 level of confidence or higher.
Non-Hypothesized Findings

The investigator analyzed the responses on the questionnaires returned by parents and educational personnel. Some of the responses stated are as follows:

Educational Personnel

Of the one hundred questionnaires returned by educational personnel, ninety per cent of the respondents stated that a variety of materials (e.g., Ginn 360, Phonics We Use, and Bookmark Series) were being used with the three Competitive Partnership Reading Programs. Thus, it may be difficult to determine whether these materials or the Competitive Partnership Program made a difference in reading scores.

Ninety per cent of the respondents stated that their schools were located in the inner-city. This was expected since Title I schools are usually located in the inner-city or the fringe of the inner-city because of the criteria used for eligibility.

Eighty to ninety per cent of the respondents stated that the Competitive Partnership Program had been effective.

Eighty to ninety per cent of the respondents stated that the program had strengths. Some of the strengths stated are as follows:

1. Students receive immediate reinforcement.
2. Parents are involved.

3. The programs are organized.

4. The programs allow for individual differences.

5. The books and materials are centered around the child's interest.

6. The programs are sequentially developed.

One to ten per cent of the respondents stated that the program had weaknesses. Some weaknesses that were stated are as follows:

1. Materials arrived late.

2. Workshops were conducted after school.

3. Too many programs in a school.

Twenty to fifty per cent of the respondents stated that the students in their schools were still reading below grade level. This was expected because Title I schools have large numbers of students reading below grade level. Therefore, to expect these students to reach grade level in a year would be unrealistic.

Parents

Of the fifty questionnaires returned by parents, the majority stated that their children had attended the current school from one to three years. This was not expected because usually Title I students are quite transient.
Eighty to ninety-five per cent of the respondents stated that they liked the Competitive Partnership Program. Some of the things they stated that they liked are as follows:

1. Children have a sense of security.
2. Children work at their own speed.
3. Materials allow for individual needs of students.
4. Parents are involved.

Two per cent of the parents stated that they disliked the program because the program was limited to Title I students only.
CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION, IMPLICATIONS AND NEED FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Chapter I provided a brief review of the basic forces, movements, and educational reform efforts during the 20th century, and efforts to upgrade achievement of urban children. It also provided a statement of the problem, definition of terms, purpose of the investigation, hypotheses, limitations, and the significance of the study.

Chapter II presented a historical perspective of the Washington, D.C. Public School System; a review of the Strayer and Passow studies, and a description and analysis of three educational reform efforts, the Model School Division, the Anacostia Community School Project, and the Academic Achievement Plan.

Chapter III described in detail the most recent effort at educational reform, the "Competitive Partnership Reading Program," which attempted to include many of the recommendations (e.g., effective staff development programs, structured community and parent involvement, and various support services and selected instructional materials).

Chapter IV provided a description of the population, method of data collection, questionnaire construction, procedures, design of the study, and
the methods for analyzing the data.

Chapter V provided the findings of the study, and lead to the support or rejection of the hypotheses as stated in the study.

This chapter will present the summary, conclusions, implications, and need for further research.

Summary

Many educators feel that education should be the great equalizer of the conditions of men, the balance wheel of the social machinery. Yet, for many urban youth, the wheel is, and has been, out of balance. Thus, it appears that schools have not made a great deal of difference, and education has failed to equip black youth, as well as less affluent white youth, for the ever changing society.

This problem is not of recent origin. It has existed for a long time. However, the surfacing of the problem at the national level caused the United States to engage in a massive effort to upgrade the achievement of urban youth.

The War on Poverty and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 were but a few of the efforts initiated to help eliminate some of the problems involved in educating youth from low-income families, the so-called "educationally deprived" children. Even though there were
massive efforts, one cannot say at this time that the efforts were entirely successful as they concerned the youths of Washington, D.C.

Since the twentieth century, when Strayer and Passow conducted extensive studies on the Washington, D.C. Public School System, and released the findings and recommendations, the School System has engaged in numerous attempts to upgrade the education of its youth.

Many of the findings and recommendations cited by the Strayer and Passow studies, e.g., a need for (1) a substantial rebuilding of instruction (2) a teacher aide and paraprofessional program, and (3) an adequate program for financing the system, were taken into consideration when the System initiated the following educational reform efforts:

1. The Model School Division.
2. The Academic Achievement Plan.
3. The Anacostia Community School Project.

Many of the efforts were considered unsuccessful because they failed to eliminate all of the ills of the city, and because the worth of the efforts were not felt city-wide. Whether or not the efforts were successful or not is debatable, however, they did a great deal to bring many issues to the forefront. Such as:

1. That there are many forces within and without the System which impede reform action, budgetary, administrative, funding, and leadership problems.
2. That transition of leadership can create problems in initiating educational reform.

3. That piecemeal and isolated attempts at reform have no lasting effect on the educational system.

Many of the models which have been developed to educate urban youths have been ill conceived and implemented by the District of Columbia School System. However, a recent effort initiated by the System, the Competitive Partnership Reading Program, an instructional program in which major publishing companies compete with one another, but in partnership with the school system in upgrading reading achievement, was launched in the Title I elementary schools during the 1972-1973 school year.

Components included in the Competitive Partnership Reading Program which many felt would assure its success were:

1. A structured parent involvement program.

2. A structured cultural enrichment program.

3. An on-going staff development program.

4. A competent instructional staff.

5. An effective pupil-personnel staff.

6. A teacher aide and paraprofessional program.

7. A variety of materials suitable for urban students.

The purpose of this study was to ascertain if the Competitive Partnership Reading Program made a significant difference in mean reading scores
of second and third grade Title I students during the first year of operation.

Mean reading scores made by second grade students on the California Achievement Tests between September, 1971 and October, 1972 were compared with mean reading scores made by those same students as third graders on the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills between October, 1972 and May, 1973. The t-test technique was used to determine if the Competitive Partnership Reading Program made a significant difference in reading scores after one year of the program.

October, 1972 reading scores were compared with May, 1973 reading scores using the t-test technique to determine if anyone of the three reading programs was more significant than the other two in upgrading reading achievement for second and third grade students, and if there were significant differences in reading scores of second and third grade students who attended schools with highly active or low parent involvement.

Conclusions

One finding of this study indicated that second and third grade students during October, 1972-May, 1973 made scores which were significant at the .05 level of confidence or higher. Thus, one can conclude with some confidence, then, that the Competitive Partnership Reading Program special program was effective. However, one can not say it was more effective than what was used the previous year because these same students
during 1971 made scores which were also significant at the .05 level of confidence or higher.

Another finding of this study indicated that second and third grade students using the three programs during October, 1972-May, 1973 made scores which were significant at the .05 level of confidence or higher. Thus, one cannot conclude that one program was more effective than the other.

The final finding of this study indicated that second and third grader attending schools with highly active parent involvement made scores which were significant at the .05 level of confidence or higher, whereas those who attended schools with low parent involvement made scores which were not significant. Thus, one can conclude that highly active parent involvement does appear to influence achievement in reading.

Specific conclusions were formulated on the basis of the major findings relative to the testing of the null hypotheses.

The first null hypothesis was accepted.

There will be no significant differences in composite reading scores of Title I students when scores made while the students were in the second grade during 1971-1972 were compared with scores the students made when they were in the third grade during 1972-1973, which was the first year of the Competitive Partnership Program.
The second null hypothesis was accepted.

There will be no significant difference in composite reading scores of second and third grade Title I students attending schools using any one of the three Competitive Partnership Programs.

The third null hypothesis was rejected.

There will be no significant relationship between scores made in reading by second and third grade Title I students who attended schools with highly active or low parent involvement.

Implications of the Study

One major implication of this study is that even though second and third grade Title I students made reading scores which were significant at the .05 level of confidence or higher during the Competitive Partnership Program, one can not say that it is, or will be, the solution to upgrading academic achievement in reading for all students. This implication is based on two factors. First, many students in second grade made reading scores which were significant at the .05 level or higher in reading one year before the Competitive Partnership was implemented. Second, neither of the three Competitive Partnership raised the reading levels of Title I students significantly higher than the other two.
Another implication concerned the effect of highly active and low parent involvement as it related to second and third grade reading scores. The findings of this study indicate that students who attended schools with highly active parent involvement made significant gains in reading, whereas students who attended schools with low parent involvement did not make significant gains. This does not imply that parent involvement alone influences academic achievement. What it does imply is that highly active parent involvement appears to be a factor in future academic motivation and that programs concerned with upgrading student achievement should involve and educate the parents.

Need for Further Research

From the findings of this study the following recommendations for further research are suggested:

1. an in depth study of the Competitive Partnership Program using individual student scores instead of mean scores for schools.

2. a study using experimental and control groups in Title I schools.

3. a study where the Competitive Partnership Program has been used with non-Title I students.
4. a major study of ESEA Title I from its beginning in 1966 in the District of Columbia to the present time.

5. an in depth study of the Competitive Partnership Program after three years of operation.
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APPENDIX A

READING SCORES--GRADE TWO
### READING SCORES

**GRADE TWO—CALIFORNIA ACHIEVEMENT TESTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Amidon/Bowen</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Perry/Simmons</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. McGogney</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Moten</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Kenilworth</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Meyer</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Giddings</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Tubman</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Savoy</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Nichol Ave.</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Lenox</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Walker Jones</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Shadd</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Van Ness</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Stanton</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Seaton</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Garrison</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Grimke</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Drew</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Montgomery</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ESEA Title I Comprehensive Program, FY 1975, Department of Federal Programs, Public Schools of the District of Columbia.**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21. Draper</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Richardson</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Tyler</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Thomas</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Nalle</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Logan</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Hendley</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Harris</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Green</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Harrison</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Slater/Langston</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Thomson</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. J. F. Cook</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Miner</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. H. D. Cooke</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Lewis</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Ketcham</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Aiton</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. J. O. Wilson</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Emery</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watkins</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goding</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turner</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lovejoy</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sumner</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX B

READING SCORES--GRADE THREE
# READING SCORES
GRADE THREE—COMPREHENSIVE TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>Oct. 1972</th>
<th>May 1973</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amidon/Bowen</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perry/Simmons</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCogney</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moten</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenilworth</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meyer</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giddings</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tubman</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savoy</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nichol Ave.</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lenox</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker Jones</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadd</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Ness</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanton</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seaton</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrison</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grimke</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drew</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### READING SCORES

GRADE THREE--COMPREHENSIVE TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>Oct. 1972</th>
<th>YEAR May 1973</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21. Draper</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Richardson</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Tyler</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Thomas</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Nalle</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Logan</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Hendley</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Harris</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Green</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Harrison</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Slater/Langston</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Thomson</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. J. F. Cooke</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Miner</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. H. D. Cooke</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Lewis</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Ketcham</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Aiton</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. J. O. Wilson</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Emery</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## READING SCORES
### GRADE THREE--COMPREHENSIVE TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>Oct. 1972</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41. Houston</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Watkins</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Goding</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Turner</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Cleveland</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Lovejoy</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Sumner</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Ludlow/Taylor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX C

LIST OF SCHOOLS USING COMPETITIVE PARTNERSHIP READING PROGRAM--GRADE TWO
List of Schools Involved in the Study of the Second Grade Students Using the Three Competitive Partnership Programs

Program A
1. Van Ness
2. Stanton
3. Seaton
4. Garrison
5. Montgomery
6. Hendley
7. Harrison
8. Slater/Langston
9. Emery
10. Houston

Program B
1. Amidon/Bowen
   Syphax
2. Tubman
3. Savoy
4. Lenox
5. Grimke
6. Richardson
7. Thomas
8. Nalle
9. Harris
10. J. F. Cooke
11. Miner
12. H. D. Cooke
13. Cleveland
14. Lovejoy

Program C
1. Walker Jones
2. Thomson
3. Ketcham
APPENDIX D

LIST OF SCHOOLS USING COMPETITIVE PARTNERSHIP READING PROGRAM--GRADE THREE
List of Schools Involve in the Study of the Third Grade Students Using the Three Competitive Partnership Programs

**Program A**

1. Van Ness  
2. Stanton  
3. Seaton  
4. Garrison  
5. Montgomery  
6. Hendley  
7. Slater/Langston  
8. H. D. Cooke  
9. Aiton  
10. Emery  
11. Houston

**Program B**

1. McGogney  
2. Kenilworth  
3. Giddings  
4. Lenox  
5. Walker Jones  
6. Grimke  
7. Richardson  
8. Nalle  
9. Harris  
10. Miner  
11. Lovejoy

**Program C**

1. Shadd  
2. Draper  
3. Thomas  
4. Thomson  
5. Ketcham
APPENDIX E

T-TEST COMPUTATION
(Tables I, II, III, IV, V)
### TABLE I (PART I)
Computation of t-test (Tables I-V)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gr. 2</td>
<td>Gr. 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>-.4</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.8</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>-.3</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>-.2</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>-.1</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>-.4</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>-.2</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>-.3</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>-.4</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>-.2</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>-.1</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>-.2</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>-.7</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mean of first scores = $64.1 \div 44 = 1.5$

Mean of second scores = $107.0 \div 44 = 2.4$

Mean of differences = $42.9 \div 44 = 0.9$

Standard deviation of differences = $\sqrt{4.82/43} = \sqrt{112.0} = 0.33$

Standard error of difference = $0.33 \div \sqrt{44} = 0.33 \div 6.6 = 0.05$

$t = 1.0$ (difference mean) 
$0.05$ (standard error of difference) 
$= 20.00$

$P < 0.01$ or higher
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Scores (Oct. 1972) Gr. 3</th>
<th>Second Scores (May 1973) Gr. 3</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Deviation from mean of Difference</th>
<th>Squared Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>-.2</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>-.5</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>-.6</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>-.5</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>-.5</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>-.1</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>-.1</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>-.1</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>-.2</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>-.2</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>-.1</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>-.2</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>-.1</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>-.5</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>-.2</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mean of first scores $= 107.0 \div 44 = 2.4$

Mean of second scores $= 138.4 \div 44 = 3.1$

Mean of differences $= 31.4 \div 44 = .7$

Standard deviation of differences $= \sqrt{3.62/43} = \sqrt{.084} = .29$

Standard error of difference $= .29 \div \sqrt{44} = .04$

$t = .7 \ (\text{Difference Mean})$

\[
\frac{.04}{.29 \div 6.6} = 17.5
\]

$P \leq .01 \text{ or higher}$
## TABLE II

Grade 2 - October 1972 - May 1973 - Program A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>-.3</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>-.4</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>-.1</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>-.2</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean of first scores = 16.5 ÷ 10 = 1.6

Mean of second scores = 24.6 ÷ 10 = 2.4

Mean of differences = 8.1 ÷ 10 = .8

Standard deviation of differences = \(\sqrt{.67/9} = \sqrt{.074} = .27\)

Standard error of difference = \(\frac{.27}{\sqrt{10}} = .087\)

\[ t = \frac{.8}{.09} (\text{Difference mean}) \]
\[ = 8.88 \]

\[ P < .01 \text{ or higher} \]
Table II

Grade 2 - October 1972 - May 1973 - Program B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Scores</th>
<th>Second Scores</th>
<th>Differences</th>
<th>Deviation from mean of Difference</th>
<th>Squared Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>-.1</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>-.1</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>-.1</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>-.1</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>-.2</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23.5 35.9 12.4 .86

Mean of first scores = 23.5 \div 14 = 1.6

Mean of second scores = 35.9 \div 14 = 2.5

Mean of differences = 12.4 \div 14 = .8

Standard deviation of differences = \sqrt{66/13} = \sqrt{0.66} = .25

Standard error of differences = .25 \div \sqrt{14} =

\frac{.25}{3.7} = .07

t = .8 (Difference mean)

.07 (Standard error of difference)

= 11.42

P < .01 or higher.
### Table II

**Grade 2 - October 1972 - May 1973**  
**Program C**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>-.2</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean of first scores = $5.5 \div 3 = 1.8$

Mean of second scores = $8.2 \div 3 = 2.7$

Mean of differences = $2.7 \div 3 = .09$

Standard deviation of differences = $\sqrt{.08/2} = \sqrt{.04} = .2$

Standard error of difference = $.2 \div \sqrt{3} = .12$

$t = \frac{.9 \text{ (Difference mean)}}{.12 \text{ (Standard error of difference)}} = 7.50$

$P < .05$ or higher
Table III

Grade 3 - October 1972 - May 1973 - Program A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>-.2</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>-.2</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>-.1</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>-.1</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 26.3                    | 35.5                     | 9.2        | .38                              |                  |

Mean of first scores = 26.3 \div 11 = 2.4

Mean of second scores = 35.5 \div 11 = 3.2

Mean of differences = 9.2 \div 11 = .8

Standard deviation of differences = \sqrt{\frac{38}{10}} = \sqrt{.03} = .19

Standard error of difference = \frac{.19}{3.3} = .057

\[ t = \frac{.8}{.06} = 13.33 \]

\[ P = .01 \text{ or higher} \]
Table III

Grade 3 - October, 1972 - May, 1973 - Program B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>-.1</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>-.5</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>-.4</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>-.1</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26.3  33.5  7.2  1.30

Mean of first scores = 26.3 ÷ 11 = 2.4

Mean of second scores = 33.5 ÷ 11 = 3.0

Mean of differences = 7.2 ÷ 11 = .6

Standard deviation of differences = √1.30/10 = √.13 = .36

Standard error of difference = .36 ÷ √11 = .36 ÷ 3.3 = .11

t = .6 (Difference mean)

.11 (Standard error of difference)

= 5.45

P <.01 or higher
### Table III

Grade 3 - October 1972 - May 1973 - Program C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>-.3</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>-.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mean of first scores** = $12.4 \div 5 = 2.4$

**Mean of second scores** = $16.7 \div 5 = 3.3$

**Mean of differences** = $4.3 \div 5 = .8$

**Standard deviation of differences** = $\sqrt{.59/4} = \sqrt{.147} = .38$

**Standard error of difference** = $.38 \div \sqrt{5} = .38 \times .22 = .172$

$t = .8 \ (\text{Difference mean})$

$.17 \ (\text{Standard error of difference})$

$= 4.70$

$P < .01 \text{ or higher}$
Table IV
(Part I)

Highly Active Parent Involvement - Grade 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>-.2</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean of first scores = $10.9 \div 7 = 1.5$

Mean of second scores = $18.5 \div 7 = 2.6$

Mean of differences = $7.6 \div 7 = 1.1$

Standard deviation of differences = $\sqrt{\frac{.07}{6}} = \sqrt{.011} = .10$

Standard error of difference = $\frac{.10}{2.6} \sqrt{7}$

$t = 1.1$ (Difference Mean)

$\frac{.04}{2.6} \sqrt{7}$ (Standard error of differences)

$= 27.50$

$P < .01$ or higher
Table IV
(Part II)

Low Parent Involvement - Grade 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>-.4</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean of first scores = 5.2 \( \div 3 = 1.7 \)

Mean of second scores = 7.0 \( \div 3 = 2.3 \)

Mean of differences = 1.8 \( \div 3 = .6 \)

Standard deviation of differences = \( \sqrt{.26/2} \approx \sqrt{13} = .36 \)

Standard error of difference = \( .36 \div \sqrt{3} = .36 / 1.7 = .21 \)

\[ t = \frac{.6}{.21} \text{ (Difference mean)} \]

\[ = 2.85 \text{ (Standard error of difference)} \]

\[ P = \text{ N.S.} \]
Table V
(Part I)

Highly Active Parent Involvement - Grade 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>-.2</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>-.5</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>-.2</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>-.1</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean of first score = $16.1 \div 7 = 2.3$

Mean of second score = $20.8 \div 7 = 2.9$

Mean of differences = $4.7 \div 7 = .7$

Standard deviation of differences = $\sqrt{46/6} = \sqrt{0.076} = .27$

Standard error of difference = $\frac{.27}{\sqrt{7}} = \frac{.27}{2.6} = .103$

$t = .7$ (Difference of mean)

$\frac{.10}{.103}$ (Standard error of difference)

= 7.00

$P < .01$ or higher
Table V  
(Part II) 
Low Parent Involvement - Grade 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>8.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.9</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>.29</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean of first score = $6.7 \div 3 = 2.2$

Mean of second score = $8.6 \div 3 = 2.8$

Mean of differences = $1.9 \div 3 = .63$

Standard deviation of differences = $\sqrt{.29/2} = \sqrt{.145} = .38$

Standard error of difference = $.38 \div \sqrt{3} =
$$.38 \div 1.7 = .22$

$t = .6 \ (\text{Difference mean})$

$.22 \ (\text{Standard error of difference})$

= $2.72$

$P = \text{N.S.}$
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>df</th>
<th>.9</th>
<th>.8</th>
<th>.7</th>
<th>.6</th>
<th>.5</th>
<th>.4</th>
<th>.3</th>
<th>.2</th>
<th>.1</th>
<th>.05</th>
<th>.02</th>
<th>.01</th>
<th>.001</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.158</td>
<td>.325</td>
<td>.510</td>
<td>.727</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.142</td>
<td>.289</td>
<td>.445</td>
<td>.617</td>
<td>.816</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>.277</td>
<td>.424</td>
<td>.584</td>
<td>.765</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>.271</td>
<td>.414</td>
<td>.569</td>
<td>.741</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>.267</td>
<td>.408</td>
<td>.559</td>
<td>.727</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.150</td>
<td>.263</td>
<td>.402</td>
<td>.549</td>
<td>.711</td>
<td>.906</td>
<td>1.119</td>
<td>1.415</td>
<td>1.893</td>
<td>2.365</td>
<td>3.098</td>
<td>3.777</td>
<td>5.997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>.262</td>
<td>.399</td>
<td>.546</td>
<td>.706</td>
<td>.899</td>
<td>1.108</td>
<td>1.397</td>
<td>1.860</td>
<td>2.306</td>
<td>2.976</td>
<td>3.555</td>
<td>5.508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>.261</td>
<td>.398</td>
<td>.543</td>
<td>.703</td>
<td>.883</td>
<td>1.100</td>
<td>1.383</td>
<td>1.833</td>
<td>2.262</td>
<td>2.821</td>
<td>3.250</td>
<td>4.781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>.260</td>
<td>.397</td>
<td>.542</td>
<td>.700</td>
<td>.879</td>
<td>1.093</td>
<td>1.372</td>
<td>1.812</td>
<td>2.228</td>
<td>2.674</td>
<td>3.169</td>
<td>4.867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>.260</td>
<td>.396</td>
<td>.540</td>
<td>.697</td>
<td>.876</td>
<td>1.088</td>
<td>1.363</td>
<td>1.796</td>
<td>2.201</td>
<td>2.718</td>
<td>3.106</td>
<td>4.417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>.258</td>
<td>.393</td>
<td>.537</td>
<td>.692</td>
<td>.868</td>
<td>1.076</td>
<td>1.345</td>
<td>1.761</td>
<td>2.145</td>
<td>2.521</td>
<td>2.977</td>
<td>4.149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>.258</td>
<td>.393</td>
<td>.536</td>
<td>.691</td>
<td>.866</td>
<td>1.074</td>
<td>1.341</td>
<td>1.753</td>
<td>2.131</td>
<td>2.502</td>
<td>2.947</td>
<td>4.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>.258</td>
<td>.392</td>
<td>.535</td>
<td>.690</td>
<td>.865</td>
<td>1.071</td>
<td>1.337</td>
<td>1.746</td>
<td>2.120</td>
<td>2.483</td>
<td>2.921</td>
<td>4.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>.257</td>
<td>.392</td>
<td>.534</td>
<td>.689</td>
<td>.863</td>
<td>1.069</td>
<td>1.333</td>
<td>1.740</td>
<td>2.110</td>
<td>2.467</td>
<td>2.898</td>
<td>3.965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>.257</td>
<td>.391</td>
<td>.533</td>
<td>.688</td>
<td>.861</td>
<td>1.066</td>
<td>1.328</td>
<td>1.734</td>
<td>2.101</td>
<td>2.452</td>
<td>2.878</td>
<td>3.922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>.256</td>
<td>.390</td>
<td>.532</td>
<td>.685</td>
<td>.858</td>
<td>1.061</td>
<td>1.321</td>
<td>1.717</td>
<td>2.074</td>
<td>2.408</td>
<td>2.819</td>
<td>3.792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>.256</td>
<td>.390</td>
<td>.531</td>
<td>.684</td>
<td>.856</td>
<td>1.058</td>
<td>1.316</td>
<td>1.708</td>
<td>2.060</td>
<td>2.385</td>
<td>2.797</td>
<td>3.745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>.256</td>
<td>.390</td>
<td>.531</td>
<td>.684</td>
<td>.856</td>
<td>1.058</td>
<td>1.315</td>
<td>1.706</td>
<td>2.056</td>
<td>2.379</td>
<td>2.787</td>
<td>3.725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>.256</td>
<td>.389</td>
<td>.531</td>
<td>.684</td>
<td>.856</td>
<td>1.058</td>
<td>1.315</td>
<td>1.705</td>
<td>2.056</td>
<td>2.379</td>
<td>2.779</td>
<td>3.707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>.256</td>
<td>.388</td>
<td>.531</td>
<td>.684</td>
<td>.855</td>
<td>1.057</td>
<td>1.314</td>
<td>1.703</td>
<td>2.052</td>
<td>2.373</td>
<td>2.771</td>
<td>3.690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>.256</td>
<td>.388</td>
<td>.531</td>
<td>.683</td>
<td>.855</td>
<td>1.056</td>
<td>1.313</td>
<td>1.701</td>
<td>2.048</td>
<td>2.367</td>
<td>2.763</td>
<td>3.674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>.256</td>
<td>.388</td>
<td>.530</td>
<td>.683</td>
<td>.854</td>
<td>1.055</td>
<td>1.311</td>
<td>1.699</td>
<td>2.045</td>
<td>2.362</td>
<td>2.756</td>
<td>3.659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>.126</td>
<td>.255</td>
<td>.388</td>
<td>.529</td>
<td>.681</td>
<td>.851</td>
<td>1.050</td>
<td>1.303</td>
<td>1.684</td>
<td>2.021</td>
<td>2.423</td>
<td>2.704</td>
<td>3.551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>.126</td>
<td>.254</td>
<td>.387</td>
<td>.527</td>
<td>.679</td>
<td>.848</td>
<td>1.046</td>
<td>1.296</td>
<td>1.671</td>
<td>1.990</td>
<td>2.390</td>
<td>2.660</td>
<td>3.460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>.126</td>
<td>.254</td>
<td>.386</td>
<td>.526</td>
<td>.677</td>
<td>.845</td>
<td>1.041</td>
<td>1.289</td>
<td>1.658</td>
<td>1.980</td>
<td>2.358</td>
<td>2.617</td>
<td>3.373</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table is adapted from Table III of R. A. Fisher and F. Yates, *Statistical Tables for Biological, Agricultural and Medical Research*, Oliver and Boyd Ltd., Edinburgh, by permission of the authors and publishers.
APPENDIX F

QUESTIONNAIRES

School Personnel
Parents
Please circle one response for each question unless otherwise instructed.

Section I General Information

1. Current position
   a. Classroom teacher
   b. Reading Specialist
   c. Reading Resource teacher
   d. Educational Aide
   e. Coordinator
   f. Other

2. Location of school
   a. Inner-city
   b. Fring of inner-city
   c. Other
   Please write name of school

3. Population of school
   a. Less than 300
   b. 301 - 500
   c. 501 - 1000
   d. 1001 - 1500
   e. 1501 - 2000
   f. 2001 - 1500
   g. 2501 and over

4. Years you have been in the position
   a. 1-4
   b. 5-9
   c. 10-14
   d. 15-19
   e. 20-24
   f. 25-29
   g. 30-34
   h. 35-39
   i. 40-44
   j. Above 44
   Please state number of years

Section II Specific Information

5. Which Competitive Partnership Reading Program is currently being used by you?
   a. D. C. Heath
   b. McGraw-Hill
   c. Random House

6. Is the current program being used alone?
   a. Yes
   b. no

7. If the answer to #6 is no, list specific materials that are being used with the program.
   a. 
   b. 
   c. 
8. How many years have you been using the Competitive Partnership Reading Program?
   a. Less than a year
   b. One year
   c. One and a half years
   d. Two years

9. Number of students reading below grade level. (test results)
   a. 10% or less
   b. 11-20%
   c. 21-20%
   d. 31-40%
   e. 41-50%
   f. 51-60%
   g. 61-70%
   h. 71-80%
   i. 81-90%
   j. 91-100%

10. Has the Competitive Partnership Reading Program been effective?
    a. yes
    b. no

11. If the answer to #10 is yes, state why. (Be specific)
    a. ________________________________
    b. ________________________________
    c. ________________________________
    d. ________________________________

12. If the answer to #10 is no, state why. (Be specific)
    a. ________________________________
    b. ________________________________
    c. ________________________________
    d. ________________________________

13. Are parents involved in the program?
    a. yes
    b. no

14. If the answer to #13 is yes, state how.
15. List what you consider the strengths of the Competitive Partnership Reading Program.

16. List the weaknesses of the program.

17. Additional comments:
QUESTIONNAIRE (Parents)

Please circle one response for each question unless otherwise instructed.

Section I General Information

1. Sex
   a. male
   b. female

2. Relationship
   a. mother
   b. father
   c. guardian
   d. Other (please state relationship)

3. Years your child has attended current school.
   a. Less than 1 year
   b. 1 - 3 years
   c. 4 - 6 years
      Please state name of school

Section II Specific Information

4. Which Competitive Partnership Reading Program is your child using?
   a. D. C. Heath
   b. McGraw-Hill
   c. Random House

5. Did you help in the planning and/or selection of the program?
   a. yes
   b. no

6. If the answer to #5 is yes, state how.

7. How are you involved in the program now?

8. What office do you hold?
9. **What** office does any of your friends hold?

10. **How many** meetings have you attended?
    a. One
    b. 2 - 4
    c. 5 - 7
    d. More than 8

11. **What is it that** you like about the Competitive Partnership in Reading?

12. **What do you dislike** about the Competitive Partnership in Reading?
APPENDIX G

TITLE I NEWS AND NOTES
(Parent Involvement)
Parents have had enrichment experiences as well as our children. Parents have had staff development opportunities and visited reading programs in action in schools and cities in Massachusetts. Also, they have attended local, national and international conferences or reading such as IRA held in Denver, Colorado. These opportunities deepen understanding of programs, purposes and techniques used to enhance our children’s skills. The major value is, of course, those home-based activities which reinforce the school based skills and concepts which parents become skilled in employing. Parents meaningfully involved in programs spells PROGRESS.

Barbara Lett Simmons
Chairman, City-Wide
Advisory Council

PARENT-PARTNERS
VOLUNTEER CORPS

Innovative thrusts foster educational change. The initiation of the Parent Partners Volunteer Corps injects innovation into the solution of a traditional problem — helping students succeed in school.

The Parent-Partners Volunteer Corps began at each Total Learning Center in the Title I Summer Program. This approach to parental involvement will be expanded during the 1973-74 school term in Title I Schools.

The parents as partners relationship is mutually beneficial to all concerned with the improvement of student achievement. The Parent-Partners Volunteer Corps draws parents into the educational program of their children, strengthens the home-school partnership, and provides benefits to parents.

CO-PARTICIPANTS:

MORGAN TEACHER AND PARENT REPORT ON CONFERENCE

Mrs. Dorothy Cobb and Mrs. Adalyne N. Hart represented Morgan School at the Federal Programs Department Conference on May 7, 8, and 9, 1973, at the Sheraton Park Hotel.

The conference was introduced as a “Showcase of Federally Funded Projects” in order to highlight the impact of federal funds on the education of our children here in the District of Columbia.

There were many exhibits that were informative and well organized. Included among the conference activities were workshops, discussion sessions, trips to observe Federal Programs in action within the schools, luncheon sessions, and the Awards Banquet.

The banquet, known as the Gold Medallion Banquet, was highlighted by the presentation of awards by Superintendent Hugh J. Scott and Associate Superintendent James T. Guines.

The musical salute rendered by the D.C. Youth Chorale with Mr. Edward Jackson directing was especially enjoyed by all present.

Adalyne M. Hart
Morgan School. Team 5
Reporter
TITLE ONE DEVELOPS POSITIVE ATTITUDES AT MORGAN

As a result of Morgan Community School’s involvement in the Title One Program, some positive attitudinal changes have been noted in children, parents, and staff. Some are:

1. Even though Morgan is a community-controlled school, and was developed from the premise of community and parental involvement, only a small degree of parent involvement was noted after the children left the Follow-Through Program (Preschool-Team 3). However, this year many Title One parents have actively participated in classroom activities. They served as tutors both on a one-to-one basis and with small groups of children. They went on field trips and attended workshops in reading and mathematics which were designed to aid them in assisting their own children at home. The parents worked in individual classrooms. They were also alerted to the day-to-day problems teachers and interns face while working with their children. Our parents have joined together and now have a functioning and viable Parent Advisory Council. Our parents sponsored a “Bingo Fun Night” for the adults in the community.

TITLE I IS HUMMING AT TURNER

Turner Elementary School’s pupil personnel worker, Jeanne Nelson, and aide, Henry Thompson, secured trips for over 450 Title I students, through the Field Trip Service of the National Park Service, to visit the different historical sites in Washington. They also sent a newsletter to Title I parents, explaining their services and the projects which had been initiated. They also planned a Summer Seminar for parents to help them become involved in the Turner Family.

Jeanne R. Nelson
Reporter

Van Ness Parent Is Pleased With Participation

I worked with Miss Sidor, a second grade teacher at Van Ness, during the Parents Volunteer Program. I felt that I was very helpful with the children who needed individual attention. Being in the classroom also made me more understanding of the teachers’ problems.

I hope I will have this privilege again.

Mrs. Bessie Fenner
Van Ness School
“BETTER LATE THAN NEVER”

On March 13, 1973, Weatherless held its first Parent Advisory Council meeting. We were quite disappointed when only three parents appeared; however, this did not deter us.

The three parents, along with other members of the Title I team decided to mobilize forces to get more parents involved in the Title I program.

We decided to do five things: (1) plan a “Luncheon-Parent Advisory Council Meeting”; (2) make home visits, and/or; (3) telephone the parents of each identified Title I pupil and personally invite them to the meeting; (4) prepare written notices to be sent home by the pupils; and, (5) present a door prize to the parent who arrived first.

These five plans were executed by two parents, Mrs. Barbara Rowe and Mrs. Carrie Scott, the pupil personnel worker and our wonderful educational aides under the direction of Mrs. Dorothy Hankins.

April 17th arrived! Our meeting was scheduled for 10:00 a.m. Breathlessly we waited and watched. Ten-thirty arrived; we had exactly four parents present. We began to wonder, had our strategy worked? You bet it did! By 10:45, we had seventeen smiling, enthusiastic parents present. Needless to say, we had a fruitful meeting and a scrumptious lunch.

The meeting was conducted cooperatively by Miss Jacqueline Anderson, Title I Pupil Personnel Worker, Mrs. Mary McKoy, Title I Math Teacher, and Miss Dorothy Butler, Title I Reading Resource Teacher.

Jacqueline Anderson
Reporter

Parental Involvement Is Great At Ross

“Having parents assist with the McGraw-Hill Reading Program is particularly helpful. Each child has more time to read orally every day with two interested persons in the classroom. Also individualized testing is easier to incorporate with a parent aide.” (Miss A.L. Rutherford)

Miss A.L. Rutherford, first grade teacher at Ross Elementary School, stated she hopes the Title I Parent Volunteer Program will continue next year as she found it a most worthwhile program. It meant she had more time to work on the individual needs of her Title I children while giving the parents a better idea of what goes on in the process of developing the reading and mathematics skills of the children. It was a learning process for the parents because, as a result of their helping in the classroom, they learned ways to help their own children at home. She would like to take this opportunity to thank the Parent Volunteer Program and in particular, Mrs. Doris Vaughn and Mrs. Lillie Trice for their help, time, and cooperation.

Jeanne Rapp
Reporter
Many at J.C. Nalle
Express Enthusiasm

"WHAT TITLE I MEANS TO ME"

"Title I to me covers just about the whole scope of child and parent relationship which not only makes the child's attitude toward learning much better, but, it also helps the parent feel more a part of the school system. The lesson learned from Title I by the children has a great effect on the community. It helps the children to have a greater respect for their elders and fellow schoolmates.

If the guidelines are followed, the system itself may be on its way to perfection. In other words, it is one step more for a good education."

Mrs. Evelyn Harris
Title I Parent

Parent Volunteer Corps Workshops

Parents of identified Title I children have been participating in all day workshops, the purpose of which was to familiarize parents with the kinds of activities children engage in during the school day.

The Reading Resource Teacher and Building Math Teacher aided parents in developing and using various reading and math aids found useful in supplementary work with small groups of children.

Danice Harris
Reporter

Parent Involvement Program

"How good it has been to see the parents of Ludlow-Taylor involved in the education of their children. Twenty parents came eager to get involved. The Tuesday workshops at the beginning of each two week period were used for explaining the three competitive programs, sharing experiences in the classroom and making teaching devices to put in their instructional kits. Most of the parents were interested in the phonetic approach to reading and handwriting. (You can't imagine how excited they were in learning better penmanship.)

We had a Christmas Party at which time they shared their experiences and gave suggestions for future parent involvement.

Ludlow is proud to say "Thanks" and "Right On" to the P.I.P.

The Reading Resource Teacher
Mrs. C. Preston

J.O. WILSON'S STAFF AND STUDENTS OBSERVE BENEFITS

"We have been able to observe the benefits derived from the Reading and Math Workshops for our mothers of the Title I Parental Volunteer Corps. All of them have said that they better understand and can more ably help the children in the school as well as their own children with daily assignments in these subjects."

Miss Patricia Murphy and
Mrs. Jacqueline Wills
Math Resource Teacher and
Reading Resource Teacher