COMPENSATORY EDUCATION ANNUAL REPORT

Program Description and Evaluation

1977-78 Fiscal Year

Elementary and Secondary

Education Act

Title I

CALIFORNIA YOUTH AUTHORITY

State of California

EDMUND G. BROWN JR.
GOVERNOR

Health and Welfare Agency

MARIO OBLEDO
SECRETARY

Department of the

Youth Authority

PEARL S. WEST,
DIRECTOR

CHARLES A. KUHL,
CHIEF DEPUTY DIRECTOR

JAMES C. BARNETT,
DEPUTY DIRECTOR
PREVENTION AND COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS BRANCH

CHON GUTIERREZ
DEPUTY DIRECTOR
MANAGEMENT SERVICES BRANCH

RUTH E. KRANOVICH,
DEPUTY DIRECTOR
PAROLE SERVICES BRANCH

FREDERICK F. MILLS,
DEPUTY DIRECTOR
PLANNING, RESEARCH, EVALUATION AND DEVELOPMENT BRANCH

GEORGE R. ROBERTS,
DEPUTY DIRECTOR
INSTITUTIONS AND CAMPS BRANCH

INSTITUTIONS AND CAMPS BRANCH

GEORGE R. ROBERTS
Deputy Director

TRUMBULL W. KELLY
Administrator, Education

ESEA STAFF

GEORGE C. VIDAL, Supervisor
Compensatory Education Program

T. PATRICK O'HARE
Education Administrator

MANNIE WEBB
Research Analyst II

CHRISTINE NEWMAN
Senior Stenographer

DEBRA HENDRICKS
Stenographer

REPORT AUTHORS

AMARJIT S. BAL, Ph. D.
Research Analyst II

JOANN MAHAN Ph. D.
Compensatory Education
Evaluation Supervisor
LDA 4241 Williamsbourgh Dr. Sacto, CA

COMPENSATORY EDUCATION
1977 - 1978

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION
AND
EVALUATION

Funded by Title I
of the
Elementary and Secondary Education Act
Public Law 89-750

Table of Contents

	Page
INTRODUCTION	v
CHAPTER I - ABSTRACT OF THE REPORT	1
CHAPTER II - PROGRAM DESCRIPTION	7
Project Budgets and Students Served	7
Characteristics of the ESEA Title I Participants	8
Summary Descriptions of Program Components	10
Etiology of Educational Retardation of ESEA Title I Students	14
Program Objectives by Projects	22
Similarities and Differences Among Ethnic Groups Within the ESEA Title I Target Group	25
CHAPTER III - PROGRAM EVALUATION	29
Evaluation Findings on Accomplishments of Achievement Objectives	29
Achievement Gains for ESEA Title I Students Discussed in Light of Selected Variables	31
Summary of Findings on Achievement Gains	44
Evaluation Findings on the Career Awareness Component	45
Evaluation Findings on Multicultural Education	46
Evaluation Findings on Staff Development	50

Page

CHAPTER IV - PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION: CONCERNS AND ACTIVITIES..... 53

Project Funding..... 53

Legal Compliance Monitoring..... 53

Evaluation Monitoring..... 54

Technical Assistance..... 54

CHAPTER V - SIGNIFICANCE OF COMPENSATORY EDUCATION IN THE YOUTH AUTHORITY..... 57

CHAPTER VI - CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS..... 59

Institutional Achievement Objectives..... 59

Age and Grade Level Growth Rates..... 60

Ethnicity and Growth Rates..... 61

Pretest Scores and Growth Rates..... 61

Length of Program Participation and Growth Rates..... 62

Career Awareness..... 63

Multicultural/Intergroup Instructions..... 63

Staff Development..... 64

REFERENCES..... 67

APPENDICES..... 69

A Description of ESEA Title I Component Variations by School..... 71

B ESEA Title I Legal Compliance Monitoring Checklist..... 77

C Program Evaluation Review Record..... 83

D Multi-Ethnic Intergroup Awareness Questionnaire..... 87

E Classroom Assessment Inventory II..... 89

List of Tables

Table		Page
1	Dollar Amounts Utilized and Students Served in the ESEA Title I Program by Institutions for 1977-78 F.Y.	7
2	Background Characteristics of Youth Authority Wards, 1977-78	9
3	Average Pretest Scores of ESEA Title I Students by Component and by Institution - 1977-78 F.Y.	10
4	Statistically Significant Differences Among Ethnic Groups on Selected Factors Relative to Reading Comprehension and Math Fundamentals Subtests of the TABE, 1977-78 F.Y. Matched Pre-Post Data	26
5	Statistically Significant Relationships to Ethnicity Between Pairs of Selected Factors Relative to Reading Comprehension and Math Fundamentals 1977-78 F.Y. Matched Pre-Post Data	28
6	Planned and Actual Grade Level Gains Per Month Averages in Reading Comprehension, English Mechancis and Math Fundamentals by Institution, 1977-78 F.Y. Matched Pre-Post Data	30
7	Relationships Between Selected Variables and Average Gains Per Month for Reading Comprehension and Math Fundamentals, 1977-78 F.Y.	32
8	Average Growth Per Month in Reading Comprehension and Math Fundamentals by Age and Pretest Ranges, All Institutions, 1977-78 F.Y., Matched Pre-Post Data	33
9	Average Growth Per Month in Reading Comprehension and Math Fundamentals by Ethnicity and Pretest Ranges, All Institutions, 1977-78 F.Y., Matched Pre-Post Data	35
10	Percentages of Students by Ethnic Groups at High, Middle, Low Growth Rates for Reading Comprehension and Math Fundamentals, 1977-78 F.Y.	36

Table		Page
11	Percentages of Students by Pretest Ranges and Averages Growth Per Month in Reading Comprehension and Math Fundamentals, 1977-78 F.Y., Matched Pre-Post Data	37
12	Ranked Institutional Growth Per Month Rates in Reading Comprehension and Math Fundamentals Displayed by Percentages of Students in Pretest Ranges	38
13	Average Growth Per Month in Reading Comprehension and Math Fundamentals by Length of Program Participation and Pretest Ranges, Matched Pre-Post Data, 1977-78 F.Y	40
14	Ranked Institutional Growth Per Month Rates in Reading Comprehension and Math Fundamentals Displayed by Percentages of Students in Program 3-8 and 9 or More Months	41
15	Institutional Monthly Growth Rates in Reading Comprehension and Math Fundamentals for Students Participating in Program 13+ Months Who Achieved Below a Month Per Month Gain, 1977-78 F.Y., Matched Pre-Post Data	42
16	Changes in Ethnic Pride and Ethnocentrism of Participants in the Multicultural Education Component by Institutions, 1977-78	48
17	Changes in Attitudes by Ethnic Groups on Ethnic Pride and Ethnocentrism Total Pre-Post Matched Data, 1977-78	48
18	Changes in Inter-Ethnic Intergroup Prejudice by Ethnic Group, Total Pre-Post Matched Data, 1977-78	49
19	Number and Percent of Staff Training by Training Area	50
20	Average Gain Per Month Scores on Subtests of TABE 1977-78 F.Y. Aggregate, Matched Pre-Post Data	58

Introduction

This report presents program descriptions of Compensatory Education Projects at ten institutions of the Youth Authority. Included, also, is an evaluative account of the program impact within ten institutions during the program year 1977-78. It is hoped that the contents of this annual report will be helpful to a variety of readers.

The educational program managers and teachers in each institution will find feedback information relative to performance of students in various components. This should assist in determining disparities, if any, between impact objectives planned for and actual performance outcomes in order to affect program improvements for maximum benefit to students.

The description of plans and analyses of evaluative data of various components at the ten institutions, along with staff opinions relative to the etiology and challenges of academic retardation among CYA youth, should help staff at individual institutions have a more comprehensive view of the compensatory education effort in the Youth Authority. It is hoped that the understanding thus derived will contribute further to the quality of program planning and implementation.

The ESEA Title I central office staff should find the report helpful as a reference resource to deal with concerns and issues relative to

the program in various institutions. The technical assistance capabilities can be specifically designed, in light of the needs, when supported by evidence in the report.

As a vehicle for dissemination of information relative to the ESEA Title I effort of the California Youth Authority, the report should serve the interests of a wide variety of readers throughout the nation. The readers are encouraged to ask for additional information since the scope of this report is not designed to deal with all aspects in an exhaustive manner.

It is generally recognized by the educational staff that the target populations have unique characteristics at each of the ten institutions. This reality, along with the varying manner of delivery of educational services to the youth, rule out comparisons of students' performance across the ten institutions. With a view to summarizing data relative to evaluation, a number of tables are included in the report. However, where appropriate, the names of institutions have been excluded because of lack of direct comparability between programs.

The report is organized in chapters to facilitate easier reference in light of the varying interests of the readers. In Chapter I and Chapter V, the reader will find the report abstract and significance of compensatory education respectively. In Chapters II and III, information on program description and evaluation is provided. Chapter IV deals with legal compliance procedures, evaluation procedures,

and technical assistance undertakings of the central office staff. The report ends with conclusions and recommendations with the hope that the compensatory education effort within the Youth Authority will not only maintain its existing meritorious performance, but augment the quality of delivery of services to the youth.

Chapter I

ABSTRACT

A total of $1,448,480 was budgeted to carry out the ESEA Title I effort during the 1977-78 program year. The number of students participating in the reading, language, math, multicultural, and career awareness components were 970, 718, 1050, 1050, and 217 respectively.

All participants in the ESEA Title I projects were non-high school graduates and under 21 years of age. The participants shared similar demographic and delinquent/criminal characteristics with the Youth Authority's overall ward population. Each project site attempted to serve the neediest of the needy students. All participants received state-funded instruction in order to qualify for supplemental assistance.

The selection criteria for participation, within the constraints of the legal mandates, varied from institution to institution. The number of students served at different institutions varied in light of the program capabilities at each of the ten projects. With the exception of Southern Reception Center-Clinic, all institutions delivered more than 15 hours per week of state-funded instruction. to each of the Title I participants. There was considerable variation in the average age of students at the ten institutions. The individualized mode of instruction has been heavily emphasized to all institutions.

A variety of reasons were offered by the school staff in explaining the prevalence of educational retardation among Youth Authority wards. Only a few of the etiological factors could be managed within the scope of compensatory education.

The various ethnic groups served by the Compensatory Education Program presented more similarities than differences on factors considered relevant in characterizing a student population. The pretest scores and duration of program participation are the two variables upon which ethnic groups differ in the reading and math components. The average pretest level of White students was clearly higher than the Spanish-Surnamed and Black students. The average duration of time in program participation was clearly more for the Black and Spanish-Surnamed students as compared to the White students.

The matched pre-post results of 966 students show that in reading, the grade level growth per month rate was .14. In language, the growth per month rate was .11 for 419 students, and in math, the growth per month rate was .16 for 951 students. The average performance of ESEA Title I students was in excess of a month per month growth rate.[1]

---

[1] Youth Authority wards are enrolled in Title I, ESEA programs for differing time periods, depending on their educational needs and length of commitment. The average grade level gain per month is the sum of students gains divided by the total number of months in program divided by the number of students. .11 grade levels per month is the same as 1.1 months of growth per month of program participation.

Out of the four factors (age, months in program, pretest level, and ethnicity) studied in this report, only two, i.e., pretest scores and number of months in program related significantly with the growth factor. Both of these variables show a strong negative relationship to the growth rates for both reading comprehension and math fundamentals. The strong negative relationships signify that the lower the pretest scores and the lesser the time of program participation, the higher will be the achievement growth rates.

The overall average gain per month scores for both reading comprehension and math fundamentals were similar for all ethnic groups when pretest scores and duration of program participation were held constant. Any observed differences were not statistically significant. When performance of different ethnic groups was compared in light of the three pretest ranges -- 1.0-3.0; 3.1-5.0; 5.1 +, it was found that the average growth per month rates were varied and many of these showed statistically significant differences in the areas of reading comprehension and math fundamentals. Although the average growth rates showed a general trend in favor of the White students relative to the three pretest ranges, yet there was an interesting, though not readily visible aspect of these growth rates. Three-fourths of the White students achieved in the range of lowest growth rates for both reading and math, whereas only fifty percent of the Black students belonged in this category.

Age of students, as a variable, did not show a relationship of significance with the growth per month rates in reading comprehension and math fundamentals. It did not make any difference in gain per month scores whether the students were a few years older or younger than the average age for their own ethnic group.

The averages for achievement gains, assessed through the various subtests of the Test of Adult Basic Education (TABE), range between satisfactory and excellent. The aggregate data from all institutions for all subtests in reading, math and language show better than month per month gains. Each of the ten institutions had a multicultural education component. The analysis of the year-end pre-post matched data (collected on the Multi-Ethnic Intergroup Awareness Questionnaire) showed improvement trends on all three dimensions measured by the questionnaire.

The staff training experiences at the ten institutions were in one or more of the 16 training areas. The staff members receiving training included project supervisors, teachers, teaching assistants, clericals, and psychologists.

The supplemental contribution of ESEA Title I effort within the Youth Authority Education Program helped the students achieve academic growth unprecedented in their earlier pubic school educational experiences. Additionally, most of the ESEA Title I projects aimed at and accomplished functional literacy for the

participants in the areas of reading, language and math. If facility in the use of words and figures is relevant for parolees in the present day American society, the contribution of compensatory education is significant. The multicultural education effort has shown that the ethnic pride and prejudice related to the concepts of ethnicity and sex in the experiences of the youth underwent changes signifying improvement trends towards intergroup maturity. Inasmuch as a repertoire of healthy and mature attitudes enriches the personal and interpersonal lives of youth, the compensatory education program seems to have made a significant contribution to one dimension of that repertoire.

In the concluding part of this report, several specific recommendations have been offered for consideration by the program managers and teaching staff. The thrust of these recommendations is toward the importance of clearly stating the desired performance expectancies for students; providing for the appropriate educational experiences; utilizing appropriate evaluative measures; and collecting the evaluation data in the most judicious manner possible.

Chapter II

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Project Budget and Students Served

The total budget for the 1977-78 Fiscal Year was $1,448,480 out of which $191,844 was the central office budget with $1,256,156 allocated to the ten institutions for delivery of services to students. The following table shows the number of students served at each institution and the dollar amounts budgeted.

TABLE 1

Dollar Amounts Utilized and Students Served in the ESEA Title I Program by Institution for 1977-78 F.Y.

Institutions	Dollar Amounts Budgeted For All Components	Number of Students Served*				
		Reading	Language	Math	Multi-cultural Education	Career Awareness
O. H. Close	$ 181,675	135	86	250	255	
Karl Holton	150,132	98	49	147	34	
DeWitt Nelson	126,210	70	70	70	70	
Fred C. Nelles	136,170	144	72	72	200	
Preston	158,312	122	**	131	All Participants	
El Paso de Robles	37,654	110	**	110	110	
Ventura	177,212	61	17	52	All Participants	109
Youth Training School	244,598	120	264	108	200	108
N.R.C.C.	13,463	60	**	60	10	
S.R.C.C.	30,730	50	**	50	50	
TOTALS	$1,256,156	970	718	1050		217

*The students in each component are not necessarily an unduplicated count. Many of the same students are likely to have been served in different components. All ESEA Title I participants received instruction in non-federally funded classes.

**The reading and language components were combined at these schools.

It should be noted that all ten institutions served students in reading, language, math and multicultural education components. Only two schools, namely Ventura School and Youth Training School, had an additional instructional component of career awareness.

The reasons for the unequal dollar amounts per student served in different institutions are rooted in the evolution of the Compensatory Education Program in the Youth Authority. During the earliest phase, funds were allocated on the basis of needs of individual institutional projects. This process eventually resulted in large differences in dollar amounts utilized by the ten institutions. During the second phase, funds became progressively scarce due to the effects of inflation on the fixed nature of federal grant monies. The allocated dollar amounts to the ten institutions have remained identical for each program year during this second phase. In the third phase commencing during the 1979-80 Fiscal Year, funds are earmarked for each institution on the basis of the number of students which meet the YA eligibility criterion for participation in the ESEA Title I Program. An important aspect of the third phase is that students in the lowest quartile of achievement will be served on the basis of top priority in each institution.

Characteristics of the ESEA Title I Participants

All participants in the ESEA Title I projects were non-high school graduates and under 21 years of age in conformity with the federal guidelines. The students shared the characteristics with the Youth Authority ward population as described in Table 2.

TABLE 2

Background Characteristics of
Youth Authority Wards, 1977-78[a]

Median Age	18 years
Violent Type of Offense	41%
Court of Commitment:	
Juvenile	56%
Adult	44%
Family Members with Criminal Records	50%
Siblings with Criminal Records	33%
In Job Market but Unemployed	44%
Broken Homes	60%
Families on Public Assistance	39%
School Dropout	45%
Ethnicity:	
White	39%
Spanish Speaking/Surname	26%
Black	32%
Other[b]	3%
Neighborhood:	
Highly Delinquent	33%
Moderately Delinquent	39%
Minimally Delinquent	22%
Non-Delinquent	6%

[a]This information has been taken from the Youth Authority publication, "A Comparison of Admission Characteristics of Youth Authority Wards, 1977-78" developed by George Davis et.al.

[b]The term "Other" students used throughout this report refers to students whose ethnicity is not White, Spanish Speaking/ Surnamed, or Black.

Table 3 provides additional information on ESEA Title I participants in the components of reading, language and mathematics at each institution. As the average pretest levels indicate, the students posed real challenges to the staff in overcoming academic retardation. The extent of success achieved through staff efforts to deal with this challenge is discussed under Chapter III of this report.

TABLE 3

Average Pretest Scores of ESEA Title I Students By Component and By Institution - F.Y. 1977-78

Institutions	Average Pretest Scores					
	READING		LANGUAGE		MATH	
	Vocabulary	Comprehension	Spelling	English Mechanics	Fundamentals	Reasonings
O. H. Close	4.9	4.8	5.7	5.6	5.7	5.8
Karl Holton	5.6	5.5	6.5	6.4	5.7	5.7
DeWitt Nelson	4.7	4.7	6.2	5.8	5.6	5.5
Fred C. Nelles	4.6	4.7	6.6	6.3	4.8	4.6
Preston	5.7	5.6	5.3	5.5	6.0	6.0
El Paso de Robles	4.7	4.6	4.6	4.5	5.4	5.3
Ventura	5.6	5.6	7.4	7.0	7.0	7.4
Youth Training School	4.0	4.1	4.1	4.2	4.7	4.4
N.R.C.C.	6.4	6.0	6.3	6.0	5.6	5.8
S.R.C.C.	4.5	4.4	3.1	4.2	4.9	4.8

Summary Descriptions of Program Components

The descriptions presented here have been derived from the data tables on various components, included under Appendix A on pages 71-75.

Reading Component

1. The selection criteria for students' participation in the Title I classrooms varied from institution to institution. The cut-off point of 8.0 grade level in reading achievement at Preston School is the highest of all institutions. The emphasis, however, across all institutions has been to deliver Title I services to the comparatively more needy students.

2. The Fred C. Nelles School served the highest number of students in the reading component. The program capabilities at each of the ten projects dictated the number of students served. Three ranges of number of students served are identified, i.e., 30-60; 70-103; 110-144. Each range includes several institutions.

3. The number of hours of instruction per week ranged from one to six hours; and excluding Southern Reception Center-Clinic, all institutions delivered more than an average 15 hours per week of instruction per student to the ESEA Title I participants in the state-funded classrooms.

4. All institutions aimed at improving the post-test scores of participants to a level of functional literacy or better.

5. The average age of students served across all institutions ranged from 16.0 years at Fred C. Nelles School to 19.6 years at the DeWitt Nelson Training Center.

6. Individualized instruction, in one form or another, has been the mode of instruction at all institutions. Low student-staff ratios seem to have facilitated the use of this method.

Language Development

1. The selection criteria for participation in this component and the number of students served varied from institution to institution.

2. The number of hours of instruction per week ranged from two to ten hours. Excluding the Karl Holton School, all institutions delivered more than fifteen hours of instruction per week to the ESEA Title I participants in the state-funded classrooms.

3. All institutions with language components in their programs aimed at a reading comprehension score of 8.0 grade level or better.

4. The age range of students served varied between 16.5 years at Fred C. Nelles School and O. H. Close School, and 19.6 years at the DeWitt Nelson Training Center.

5. Individualized mode of instruction was utilized by even those schools which had unfavorable staff-student ratios such as 1:12 at Fred C. Nelles School and 1:14 at the Youth Training School.

Math Component

1. The math achievement level used as a cut-off point above which students were not eligible for participation in the ESEA Title I Program was not uniform across institutions.

2. The O. H. Close School served the highest number of students under this component. In five institutions, math students were instructed in such a way that one group received instruction more hours per week than the second group.

3. All institutions, with the exception of Karl Holton School and S.R.C.C., provided more than an average of 15 hours per week of instruction per student in state-funded classes.

4. The average age of participating students ranged between 16.5 years at Fred C. Nelles School and O. H. Close School, and 19.6 years at DeWitt Nelson Training Center.

5. The staff-pupil ratio varied greatly with 1:2 at the El Paso de Robles School and 1:12 at Fred C. Nelles School.

6. Individualized instruction was the preferred mode of the delivery of instructional services at all institutions.

Multicultural Education

1. The students served under the reading, language or math component in compensatory education classes were eligible for participation in the multicultural education component at all institutions.

3. The number of hours of instruction per week ranged from one to ten hours.

4. The staff-student ratios varied from institution to institution, and in most cases, there were comparatively more students per staff in this component than either of the reading, language, and math components.

5. The modes of instruction in most cases have been audio-visual and/or inquiry-discussion.

Etiology of Educational Retardation of Title I Students

The 1977-78 grant application format asked for the reason why students' educational performance was below levels expected for their age when they enter the Youth Authority Education Program. A variety of explanations were offered by staff at the ten institutions. The opinions have been consolidated and are presented below under each component. Many of the explanations that account for educational retardation among the ESEA Title I participants, overlap across various components. It is hoped that the lists of opinions presented will be useful in understanding the educational background of the participants. A comprehensive understanding of the profile of students' characteristics puts staff at an advantage to provide needed educational experiences to their students.

The staff opinions accounting for the educational retardation of the incarcerated youth are categorized as follows:

Reading

Family Experience

1. Socially, emotionally and educationally deprived home environments.
2. Broken homes.
3. A language other than English spoken at home.
4. Criminal or delinquent family history of many youth.
5. Chaotic family situations.

School Experience

1. Irregular school attendance.
2. Lack of motivation and lack of incentive for academic progress.
3. Inadequate methodology.
4. Inappropriate diagnosis and/or prescription.
5. Cummulative educational deficit.
6. Hatred of school and others.
7. Truancy.
8. Below standard educational materials.
9. Below standard physical environment of schools.
10. Dropout.
11. Frequent change of schools.
12. Early failure in overcrowded classrooms.
13. Discipline problems in the classroom.

Physiological/Personality

1. Learning disabilities including aphasia, dyslexia, reversals, lateral disorders, etc.
2. Poor self-image.
3. Poor ego state.
4. Aggressiveness against others.
5. Prior delinquent and criminal history.
6. Neurological or emotional impediments to learning.
7. Uncorrected hearing or vision disabilities.
8. Arrested level of maturation and/or skill development.
9. Lack of readiness to learn.
10. Poor self-concept.
11. Drug abuse.

General Environment

1. Negative peer group association.
2. Inappropriate identification models for academic achievement.
3. Lack of environmental stimuli during formative years.
4. Lack of educational opportunity due to migrant labor conditions.
5. Lack of concentrated effort to assist youth.
6. Delinquent neighborhood.

Language

The staff has mentioned all opinions expressed under the Reading Component as well as the following:

1. Lack of written communication skills.
2. Lack of specific training in written communication skills.
3. Inadequate attention to individual needs.

Math

The staff expressed the same opinions as under the Reading Component in addition to the following:

1. Neglect to use math skills in daily life.
2. Lack of basic math skills.
3. Insufficient experience in practical application of math skills to daily tasks.
4. Limited relationship of arithmetic process to daily life.
5. Insufficiently developed perceptual, relational and verbal abilities.
6. Lack of parental concern.

Multicultural Education

Family Experience

1. Broken homes.
2. Inadequate family income.
3. Criminal/delinquent family history.

School Experience

1. Lack of value clarification experiences within multicultural situations.
2. Dropout from school.
3. Lack of knowledge of the contributions, involvement, and history of the various cultural and ethnic groups and women.
4. Lack of knowledge of cultural trends and developments, such as civil rights, integration, etc.
5. Lack of information about other cultural groups and their heritage.

Personality

1. Insufficient knowledge about the characteristics of other ethnic groups results in lack of respect, and leads to derogation of others.
2. Prior delinquent/criminal records.
3. Lack of positive self-concept characteristics of delinquent children may contribute to negative view of others.

General Environment

1. Lack of crosscultural interaction.
2. Lack of guided educational and social interaction due to segregated classes, schools, housing, etc.

3. Lack of exposure and experiences with members of different cultural ethnic groups.

4. Neighborhood population patterns rule out exposure to members of other ethnic and cultural groups.

5. Plethora of problems which impede the development of humanistic values and attitudes.

6. Delinquent neighborhoods.

7. Appropriate identification models not available.

8. Inaccurate historical, cultural, racial, and socioeconomic ideas about practices and styles of different people.

9. Males and females socialized to believe that women are not equal to men.

Institutional Experience

1. Institutional peer pressures to belong to ethnic groupings.

Career Awareness

Family Experience

1. Low socioeconomic status.
2. Broken homes.

School Experience

1. Lack of success in school.
2. Below standard vocational training programs.
3. Below standard physical environment of schools.
4. Truancy.
5. Dropout from school.
6. Inadequate career counseling and testing; career options remain unconsidered and unexplored.

Personality

1. Poor self-image.
2. History of institutional living.
3. Limited or no previous occupational experiences.
4. Lack of knowledge about relationship of math and language to career.

General Environment

1. Poor models for identification.
2. Inadequate exposure to career concepts in homes, communities, and schools.
3. Inadequate opportunities to develop and practice decision making skills.

4. Inadequate opportunities to discuss prerequisites to certain careers.

5. Inadequate counseling regarding self-assessment and establishment of realistic educational and career goals.

6. Inadequate instruction or practice in developing job survival skills.

ESEA Title I Program Objectives, Measured by TABE by Component and Institution, 1977-78 Fiscal Year

Institution	Program Objectives		
	Reading	Language	Math
O. H. Close	1. Those students reading below 6.5 will achieve an average gain of .15 grade levels per month in comprehension and vocabulary as measured by a standarized test, TABE, level M. 2. Those students testing between 6.5 and 8.5 on the reading section of the TABE (levels D,M) test will show an average gain of .11 grade levels per month in vocabulary and comprehension as measured by this standarized test.	Those students testing between 6.5 and 8.5 on the reading section of the TABE (levels D,M) will show an average gain of .15 grade levels per month on the language section of the TABE in mechanics of English and spelling as measured by this standarized test...	Those students testing below 7.5 will gain an average of 2.0 months in arithmetic fundamentals and 1.5 reasoning as measured by the TABE test.
Karl Holton	The mean gain in reading comprehension for students scoring 6.5 and below as measured by the TABE will equal or exceed two and one-half months for each month of participation in the program.	Each student will raise his mechanics of English score 1.5 months per month of participation in the Learning Resource Center.	Achievement by participation in both Arithmetic Reasoning and Arithmetic Fundamentals as measured by pre-post administration of the arithmetic section of the TABE.

Program Objectives

Institution	Reading	Language	Math
DeWitt Nelson	Target population (1-6 grade reading level) will demonstrate .15 months gain in reading vocabulary and comprehension as measured by TABE for each month of program participation.	Students will demonstrate improvement by .15 in the capitalization, punctuation, and expression sections of the TABE.	Target population(1-6 grade level) will demonstrate .15 months gain in math skills as measured by TABE participation.
Preston	Students will have a growth of .11 grade level per month as measured by the TABE test in reading vocabulary and comprehension.	Participants in the ESEA language program will demonstrate a growth rate of .11 grade level per month as measured by the TABE test as a result of instruction in spelling and mechanics of English.	Participants in the ESEA, a math program will have a growth rate of .11 grade level or better as measured by the TABE test by demonstrating an understanding of the number system and an ability to compute accurately and apply problem solving techniques.
Fred C. Nelles	Reading lab participants will gain .11 grade level per month of participation as measured by the TABE Reading Vocabulary and Reading Comprehension subtest.	Participants will show a gain of .11 per month of participation in Language Arts as determined by using the TABE mechanics of English/Spelling subtests.	Participants will gain .11 grade level per month of participation as measured by the TABE Arithmetic Reasoning and Arithmetic Fundamentals subtests.
El Paso De Robles	Participants will show, through pre and post TABE, an average minimum growth of .11 for every month in the program.	Participants will show, through pre and post TABE, an average minimum growth of .11 for every month in the program.	Participants will show through pre and post TABE an average minimum growth of .11 for every month in the program.

Program Objectives

Institution	Reading	Language	Math
Ventura	1. Increase their (participants) reading vocabulary and comprehension scores an average of at least .12 a month for each month's participation as measured by the TABE. 2. Participants who are initially more competent in a non-English language will increase their reading scores an average of at least .10 monthly for each month's participation, as measured by TABE.	1. As a result of participating in the IMTS language activity students will increase their Mechanics of English and Spelling scores an average of at least .12 grade levels a month for each month's participation as measured by the TABE.	As a result of participating in the IMTS math activity students will increase their math fundamentals and math reasoning scores an average of at least .12 a month for each month's participation, as measured by TABE.
Youth Training School	The target population will gain an average of more than one month gain in reading vocabulary and comprehension for each month of participation in the reading program as measured by TABE.	All participants will gain an average of at least one month in language skills for every month of participation in the language development component as measured by the TABE.	Students, on the average, will gain at least one month of achievement for each month of attendance in math reasoning and fundamentals as measured by pre and post administration of the TABE.
* NRCC	By June 30, 1978 the participants will have gained 1.5 months growth in total reading score for each month of participation as measured by the Reading Subtests of the TABE.	By June 30, 1978 the participants will have gained 1.5 months growth in total language skills for each month of participation as measured by the Language Subtests of the TABE.	By June 30, 1978 the students will have gained 1.5 months growth in total arithmetic for each month of participation as measured by the Arithmetic Subtests of the TABE.
* SRCC	70% of the participants will make one month's growth in reading for each month's actual participation in the language development/reading program with twenty periods of actual participation considered one month.	70% of the participants will make one month's growth in language development for each month's actual participation in the language development/reading program with twenty periods of actual participation considered one month.	70% of the participants will make one month's growth in mathematics for each month's actual participation in the mathematics program with twenty periods of participation considered one month.

* The Reading and Language Components at NRCC and SRCC are combined.

Similarities and Differences Among Ethnic Groups Within the ESEA Title I Target Population

The relationship of age, pretest level, and length of program participation to the ethnic backgrounds of participating students in the ESEA Program has been examined in several prior Youth Authority reports. To further objectify the relationship of ethnicity and these specified factors, the available matched pre-post data for Reading Comprehension and Math Fundamentals for the 1977-78 program year was analyzed. The data is presented in Table 4 . There were 277 White; 234 Spanish-Surnamed; 412 Black; and 43 "Other" students in the Reading Comprehension component for whom matched pre-post data was available. In the case of Math Fundamentals component, similar data was available for 330 White; 222 Spanish-Surnamed; 341 Black; and 57 "Other" students. The analysis resulted in the findings enumerated below:

Reading Comprehension

1. The average ages of White, Black, Spanish-Surnamed and "Other" students were very similar.

2. The average pretest levels of White and "Other" students were higher than the Spanish-Surnamed and Black students. These differences are statistically significant.

3. The average duration of time in program participation (months in program) was statistically significantly more for the Black and Spanish-Surnamed students compared to the White and "Other" students.

TABLE 4

Statistically Significant Differences Among Ethnic Groups On Selected Factors Relative to Reading Comprehension and Math Fundamentals Subtests of the TABE, 1977-78 F.Y. Matched Pre-Post Data[a]

Component	Factors	Ethnic Groups: White	Sp.-Sur.	Black	Other	Level of Confidence	Totals
Reading Comprehension	Average Pretest Scores	5.9	5.1	4.8	5.9	P <.001	5.2
	N=	(277)	(234)	(412)	(43)		(966)
	Average Months in Program	7.2	7.7	8.2	5.8	P<.001	7.5
	N=	(277)	(234)	(412)	(43)		(966)
	Average Age	17.1	17.0	17.0	16.7	Ø	17.0
	N=	(276)	(234)	(412)	(43)		(965)[b]
Math Fundamentals	Average Pretest Scores	6.1	5.4	5.4	6.3	P<.001	5.7
	N=	(331)	(222)	(341)	(57)		(951)
	Average Months in Program	7.4	7.5	8.0	6.1	P< .05	7.4
	N=	(331)	(222)	(341)	(57)		(951)
	Average Age	17.1	17.1	17.2	16.9	Ø	17.1
	N=	(330)	(222)	(341)	(55)		(948)[b]

[a] The findings presented are derived from a Data Text Computer Program using analysis of variance techniques.

[b] The numbers used in the analysis are slightly different due to blanks for some factors.

Math Fundamentals

1. The average ages of White, Black, Spanish-Surnamed and "Other" students were very similar.

2. The average pretest levels of White and "Other" students were statistically significantly higher than the Spanish-Surnamed and Black students.

3. The average duration of time in program participation was statistically significantly more for the Black students as compared to White, Spanish-Surnamed and "Other" students.

The data was further analyzed to see if the age and pretest scores of students of different ethnic groups were related to the duration of program participation. The relationship of age to pretest scores was also studied for all ethnic groups. These relationships are shown in Table 5. The results of the analysis are given below:

Reading Comprehension

1. The age of students was not related to how long they will participate in the component. This held true for all ethnic groups.

2. The pretest scores of students showed no relationship to the duration of program participation across all ethnic groups.

3. The pretest scores of the Spanish-Surnamed, Black and "Other" students were not related to age. However, the pretest scores of White students were related negatively with age meaning that older White students tended to have lower pretest scores and the younger White students tended to have higher pretest scores.

Math Fundamentals

1. The age of students was not related to how long they will participate in the component. This held true for all ethnic groups.

TABLE 5

Statistically Significant Relationships to Ethnicity Between Pairs of Selected Factors Relative to Reading Comprehension and Math Fundamentals 1977-78 F.Y. Matched Pre-Post Data

Components	Paired Factors	Ethnic Groups			
		White	Sp.-Sur.	Black	Other
Reading Comprehension	Age & Months in Program	Ø	Ø	Ø	Ø
	Age & Pretest Scores	- P<.01	Ø	Ø	Ø
	Pretest Scores & Months in Program	Ø	Ø	Ø	Ø
Math Fundamentals	Age & Months in Program	Ø	Ø	Ø	Ø
	Age & Pretest Scores	Ø	+ P<.001	Ø	Ø
	Pretest Scores & Months in Program	Ø	Ø	Ø	Ø

Ø = no relationship
- = negative relationship
+ = positive relationship

2. The pretest scores of students showed no relationship to the duration of program participation across all ethnic groups.

3. The pretest scores of White, Black and "Other" students were not related to age. However, the pretest scores of Spanish-Surnamed Students related positively with age meaning that younger Spanish-Surnamed students tended to have lower pretest scores and older students tended to have higher pretest scores.

Chapter III

PROGRAM EVALUATION

Evaluation Findings on Accomplishments of Achievement Objectives, 1977-78

The growth per month rates of ESEA Title I students are available on all subtests of the standardized Test of Adult Basic Education (TABE). In this report, however, discussion is limited to only three subtests: Reading Comprehension; English Mechanics (a language subtest); and Math Fundamentals. The results presented in Table 6 are based on the matched pre-post data collected throughout the 1977-78 fiscal year.

Before discussing the grade level gain per month figures (noted in Table 6) in light of the frequencies with which objectives were met/exceeded at the ten institutions, a few observations are in order relative to the aggregate performance of ESEA Title I students. The matched pre-post results of 966 reading students show a growth per month rate of .14 grade levels in reading comprehension. In language, the growth per month rate is .11 grade levels for 552 students, and in math, the gain per month is .16 grade levels for 951 students. The average performance of ESEA Title I students on all three subtests is in excess of the month per month growth rate. Table 6 also shows differences in growth rates within and among institutions relative to the three academic areas. A brief narrative is provided below for an overview.

TABLE 6

Planned and Actual Grade Level Gains Per Month Averages in Reading Comprehension, English Mechanics and Math Fundamentals by Institution, 1977-78 F.Y. Matched Pre-Post Data

Institutions	Reading Comprehension Gains per Month[a]		English Mechanics Gains per Month		Math Fundamentals Gains per Month	
	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual
1	.14	.13 (251)[b]	.15	.11 (94)	.20	.19 (255)
2	.25	.19 (163)	.15	.12 (71)	.15	.19 (204)
3	.15	.08 (34)	.15	.15 (10)	.15	.14 (39)
4	.11	.11 (103)	.11	.07 (82)	.11	.12 (125)
5	.11	.13 (125)	.11	.14 (32)	.11	.09 (78)
6	.11	.15 (101)	.11	.14 (44)	.11	.12 (67)
7	.12	.21 (73)	.12	.17 (19)	.12	.23 (74)
8	.11	.12 (79)	.11	.10 (43)	.11	.15 (66)
9	.15	.17 (20)	.15	.16 (18)	.15	.15 (35)
10	.11	.05 (8)	.11	-.06 (6)	.11	.03 (8)
Totals	.11[c]	.14 (966)	.11[c]	.11 (419)	.11[c]	.16 (951)

[a]The growth per month rate is the sum of the students' grade level gain per month divided by the number of students.

[b]Numbers in parentheses indicate the number of students for whom pre and post test data is available.

[c]The minimum growth rate required in Title I, ESEA projects.

Reading Comprehension

Five institutions exceeded their planned objectives. Three institutions fell short of planned performance, and two institutions reported equivalent performance to the planned objective.

English Mechanics

Four institutions exceeded their planned objectives. Five insti-

tutions fell short of planned performance; one showed equivalence between the planned and actual outcomes.

Math Fundamentals

Five institutions exceeded their planned objectives; four institutions fell short of planned performance, and one institution achieved a growth rate as planned.

The differences in growth rates within institutions and across institutions (discussed in the next section) prevail as a result of complex factors affecting achievement.

Achievement Gains for ESEA Title I Students Discussed in Light of Selected Variables

In this section an overview of the findings on achievement gains by Compensatory Education students is presented followed by a discussion of the specific findings relative to grade level growth per month in the Reading Comprehension, and Math Fundamentals subtests of TABE. Four variables, namely ethnicity, length of program participation, age of students, and pretest scores are discussed in relationship to the grade level gain per month of program participants.

OVERVIEW

Matched pre-post achievement data for Reading Comprehension and Math Fundamentals were used in the analysis of the data that follows. No significant relationship was found between the gain

per month rates of students and their ages, nor the ethnicity of the students for the aggregate 1977-78 data.

The variables of pretest scores and length of program participation showed a strong negative relationship to the growth per month rates of White, Black and Spanish-Surnamed students on Reading Comprehension and Math Fundamentals. The presence of these strong relationships means that the students with lower pretest scores made higher gains as compared to students with higher pretest scores. Furthermore, the students who remained in the program for a longer period of time made lower monthly rates of gain as compared to those students who were in the Reading or Math programs for shorter durations of time.

The "Other" students' pretest scores also showed a strong negative correlation with their gain per month scores. However, the months in program of these "Other" students did not show a significant relationship to the growth per month rates.

Table 7 presents the relationship described above.

TABLE 7

Relationships Between Selected Variables and Average Gains per Month for Reading Comprehension and Math Fundamentals 1977-78 F.Y.

Selected Variables	Reading Comprehension — Relationship to Average Gain per Mo. by Ethnicity					Math Fundamentals — Relationship to Average Gain per Mo. by Ethnicity				
	Totals	White	Sp.-Sur.	Black	Other	Totals	White	Sp.-Sur.	Black	Other
Age	Ø	Ø	Ø	Ø	Ø	Ø	Ø	Ø	Ø	Ø
Months in Program	- P≤.001	- (P≤.001)	- (P≤.01)	- P≤.01	Ø	- P≤.05	- P≤.001	- P≤.01	- P≤.001	Ø
Pretest Level	- P≤.001	- (P≤.001)	- (P≤.001)	- (P≤.001)	- P≤.05	- P≤.001	- (P≤.001)	- (P≤.001)	- (P≤.001)	- P≤.01

Ø No relationship
- Negative relationship

DISCUSSION OF SPECIFIC FINDINGS

1. Age of Students and Their Gain Per Month Rates by Pretest Score Ranges

It has been noted in the overview that the variable of age showed no relationship with the grade level gains per month of students when the data was studied without sub-grouping them into age and pretest score ranges. However, when the data are grouped as shown in Table 8, some interesting observations can be made.

TABLE 8

Average Growth Per Month in Reading Comprehension and Math Fundamentals by Age and Pretest Ranges, All Institutions 1977-78, F.Y. Matched Pre-Post Data

TABE Subtests	Pretest Ranges	Average Gain Per Month by Age Ranges 13-15	16-18	Over 18	Totals
Reading Comprehension	1.0-3.0	.10 (7)[a]	.21 (55)	.21 (16)	.20 (78)
	3.1-5.0	.19 (45)	.18 (217)	.15 (67)	.18 (329)
	5.1 +	.10 (84)	.13 (387)	.11 (86)	.12 (557)
	Totals	.13 (136)	.15 (659)	.14 (169)	.14 (964)
Math Fundamentals	1.0-3.0	.39 (5)	.44 (17)	.53 (7)	.45 (29)
	3.1-5.0	.18 (42)	.21 (211)	.14 (45)	.20 (298)
	5.1 +	.12 (57)	.12 (431)	.17 (130)	.13 (620)
	Totals	.16 (104)	.16 (659)	.17 (182)	.16 (947)

[a]Numbers in parentheses indicate the number of students for whom pre-post test data is available.

a. No uniform trend in gain per month rates was discernible in relation to increments in pretest scores or age in the case of Reading Comprehension.

b. A diminishing trend in gain per month rates was discernible in relation to increments in pretest scores in the case of Math Fundamentals.

c. No uniform trend in gain per month rates was discernible in relation to increments in age in the case of Math Fundamentals.

d. Average monthly gains in Math Fundamentals were higher than a month per month gain for all age levels and pretest ranges.

e. The students in the group with 1.0-3.0 pretest scores and 13-15 years of age, as well as the students in the group with 5.1 + pretest scores and 13-15 years of age, made an average monthly growth of less than a month per month in Reading Comprehension.

2. Ethnicity of Students and Their Gain Per Month Rates by Pretest Score Ranges

It has been pointed out earlier in the overview that the variable of ethnicity showed no relationship with the gain per month rates of students when the data was studied in aggregate. However, when the data is viewed by pretest score ranges (Table 9), there are notable differences between ethnic groups in both Reading Comprehension and Math Fundamentals.

a. A uniform trend in average growth per month rates is discernible favoring the lower pretest ranges for the White, Spanish-Surnamed, Black and "Other" students. This finding of a negative relationship between pretest scores and gain per month rates has been discussed in the overview on pages 31-32.

b. All students, except the 189 Black students in the 5.1 + pretest range of the Reading Comprehension, made an average gain of more than one month per month. All students, except the 47 "Other" students in the 5.1 + pretest range of the Math Fundamentals, made an average gain of more than one month per month in program.

TABLE 9

Average Growth Per Month in Reading Comprehension and Math Fundamentals by Ethnicity and Pretest Ranges, All Institutions 1977-78 F.Y., Matched Pre-Post Data

TABE Subtests	Pretest Ranges	Average Gain Per Month by Ethnic Groups				
		White	Sp.-Sur.	Black	Other	Totals
Reading Comprehension	1.0-3.0	.21 (8)[a]	.32 (13)	.16 (55)	.38 (2)	.20 (78)
	3.1-5.0	.23 (64)	.16 (88)	.15 (168)	.21 (10)	.18 (330)
	5.1 +	.14 (203)	.12 (134)	.10 (189)	.13 (31)	.12 (557)
	Totals	.16 (275)	.15 (235)	.13 (412)	.16 (43)	.14 (965)
Math Fundamentals	1.0-3.0	.41 (7)	.55 (10)	.37 (11)	.64 (1)	.45 (29)
	3.1-5.0	.30 (72)	.16 (82)	.16 (135)	.24 (9)	.20 (298)
	5.1 +	.15 (251)	.13 (130)	.11 (195)	.09 (47)	.13 (623)
	Totals	.19 (330)	.16 (222)	.14 (341)	.13 (59)	.16 (950)

[a]Numbers in parentheses indicate the number of students for whom pre-post test data is available.

c. Although the average growth rates shown in Table 9 for Reading Comprehension and Math Fundamentals indicate a general trend towards higher gains for White students, there is a not readily visible higher grade level growth rate for the Black students. If we designate the growth rates connected with the pretest ranges of 1.0-3.0; 3.1-5.0; and 5.1 + as high, middle and low growth levels respectively, we can determine the relative percent figures at these growth levels for each ethnic group. Table 10 provides the percentages of students connected with three levels of growth rates of all participating students. Seventy-four percent (74%) of the White students were at the lowest growth level in Reading

TABLE 10

Percentages of Students by Ethnic Groups at High, Middle, Low Growth Rates for Reading Comprehension and Math Fundamentals, 1977-78 F.Y.

Ethnic Group	Reading Comprehension				Math Fundamentals			
	No. of Students	Percentage of Students by Growth Rate			No. of Students	Percentage of Students by Growth Rate		
		High	Middle	Low		High	Middle	Low
White	275	3	23	74	330	2	22	76
Sp.-Sur.	235	6	37	57	222	5	37	58
Black	412	13	41	46	341	3	40	57
"Other"	43	5	23	72	57	2	16	82

Comprehension, and 76% of the White students were at the lowest growth level in Math Fundamentals. Compared to these figures, 46% of the Black students had the lowest level growth rates in Reading Comprehension, and 57% of the Black students had the lowest level growth rates in Math Fundamentals.

3. Pretest Scores of Students and Their Gain Per Month Rates

The average gain per month rates in Reading Comprehension and Math Fundamentals for the total matched pre-post data are .15 and .16 respectively. Table 11 shows differences in gain per month averages for both Reading Comprehension and Math Fundamentals when the averages are compared to the three ranges of pretest scores -- 1.0-3.0; 3.1-5.0; 5.1 +. The diminishing growth rates connected to the increasing pretest levels are only a confirmation of the finding discussed above--that the pretest scores are negatively correlated with the growth rates.

TABLE 11

Percentages of Students by Pretest Ranges and Average Growth Per Month in Reading Comprehension and Math Fundamentals 1977-78 F.Y. Matched Pre-Post Data

Pretest Ranges	Reading Comprehension		Math Fundamentals	
	Percentage of Students	Average Growth Rate	Percentage of Students	Average Growth Rate
1.0-3.0	8 (78)[a]	.20	3 (29)	.45
3.1-5.0	34 (330)	.18	31 (298)	.20
5.1 +	58 (557)	.12	66 (623)	.13
Totals	100 (965)	.14	100 (950)	.16

[a]Numbers in parentheses indicate the number of students for whom data is available.

Although the association of lower pretest scores with higher growth per month scores is partially explainable by such statistical phenomenon as the regression toward the mean, there may be several other factors in operation in the achievement improvement of compensatory education youth. Some of these factors could be:

a. The staff more effectively motivates the students who score lower on pretests.

b. The staff provides better diagnostic and prescriptive services to lower pretesters.

c. The staff concentrate more effort toward improving the performance of lower pretesters.

d. Lower pretesters are intrinsically more inclined toward "catching up" than higher pretesters in the institutional setting.

e. The content at lower level of difficulty is easier to learn than the content at higher levels.

For both Reading Comprehension and Math Fundamentals, the highest percent of students is at the 5.1 + pretest level and the lowest percent of students is at the 1.0-3.0 pretest level as shown in Table 11. The percentages of students at these levels in the ten institutions, however, do not correlate with the above finding which is based on the aggregate data from all institutions. As shown in Table 12, some school programs have higher percent of students in the 5.1 + pretest level.

TABLE 12

Ranked Institutional Growth Per Month Rates in Reading Comprehension and Math Fundamentals Displayed by Percentages of Students in Pretest Ranges

	Reading Comprehension			Math Fundamentals		
	Gain Per Month	1 - 5.0 %	5.1 + %	Gain Per Month	1 - 5.0 %	5.1 + %
Individual Institutional Growth Rates	.21	26	74	.23	5	95
	.19	34	66	.19	34	66
	.17	49	51	.19	30	70
	.17	21	79	.15	23	77
	.15	54	46	.15	64	36
	.13	49	51	.14	46	54
	.12	71	29	.12	35	65
	.11	45	55	.12	26	74
	.08	71	29	.09	62	39
	.05	75	25	.03	63	37
TOTALS	.15	42	58	.16	34	66

Contrary to the expectation that the school with a higher percentage of students in the 5.1 + pretest level will make lower gains, several such schools have shown higher gains in Reading Comprehension as well as Math Fundamentals (Table 12). The explanation of this phenomenon lies partially in the factor of months of program participation which is negatively related to the gain per month rates in a statistically significant manner. Schools showing higher gains per month rates tend to have higher percentages of students programmed for shorter durations of time. (See Table 14.)

4. Length of Participation in Program by ESEA Students and Gain Per Month Rates

The average gain per month in Reading Comprehension and Math Fundamentals for the total matched pre-post data are .15 and .16 respectively. Table 13 shows differences in gain per month averages for Reading Comprehension and Math Fundamentals when the averages are compared on the three ranges of months of program participation -- 3-5, 6-8, 9 +. The diminishing growth rates connected with the increasing length of program are only a confirmation of the finding discussed on page 32 that the length of program participation is negatively correlated with the growth rates. The following conclusions are based upon the data provided in Table 13 and apply to both the Reading Comprehension and Math Fundamentals subtests of the TABE:

TABLE 13

Average Growth Per Month in Reading Comprehension and Math Fundamentals by Length of Program Participation and Pretest Ranges Matched Pre-Post Data, 1977-78 F.Y.

TABE Subtests	Pretest Score Ranges	Length of Program Participation in Ranges (Months)		
		3-5	6-8	9 or more
Reading Comprehension	1.0 - 3.0	.25 (31)[a]	.22 (24)	.09 (22)
	3.1 - 5.0	.23 (134)	.17 (101)	.10 (95)
	5.1 +	.14 (284)	.11 (148)	.09 (124)
	Totals	.17 (449)	.14 (273)	.09 (241)
Math Fundamentals	1.0 - 3.0	.57 (14)	.40 (9)	.25 (6)
	3.1 - 5.0	.28 (122)	.19 (93)	.09 (82)
	5.1 +	.17 (309)	.10 (169)	.09 (145)
	Totals	.21 (445)	.14 (271)	.09 (233)

[a]Numbers in parentheses indicate the number of students for whom pre and post test data is available.

a. The highest growth rates are found in the 3-5 months length of participation range.

b. The lowest growth rates are found in the 9 + months length of participation range.

c. Contrasting the growth rates of the total number of students in the 3-5, 6-8 and 9 + months length of participation ranges, the only range in which students did not achieve a month per month growth rate is the 9 + months range.

d. The majority of students participated in program for less than 9 months -- 75% and 76% respectively in Reading and Math.

TABLE 14

Ranked Institutional Growth Per Month Rates in Reading Comprehension and Math Fundamentals Displayed by Percentages of Students in Program 3-8 and 9 or More Months

	Reading Comprehension			Math Fundamentals		
	Gain per Month	3-8 Months	9+ Months	Gain per Month	3-8 Months	9+ Months
		%	%		%	%
	.21	80	20	.23	85	15
	.19	77	23	.19	78	22
Individual	.17	73	27	.19	76	24
Institutional	.17	78	22	.15	91	9
Growth	.15	74	26	.15	69	31
Rates	.13	78	22	.14	76	24
	.12	84	16	.12	80	20
	.11	59	41	.12	65	35
	.08	68	32	.09	65	35
	.05	38	63	.03	38	62
Totals	.15	75	25	.16	75	25

The percentages of students in Reading and Math for durations in excess of 8 months show considerable variation across the ten institutions as presented in Table 14. Table 14 also provides the variation in growth rates which is in part related to the variation in length of program participation at the ten institutions.

Ninety-three students were assigned to the Reading Component for durations of 13 or more months. One-third of these students performed at or above a month per month growth rate,

TABLE 15

Institutional Monthly Growth Rates in Reading Comprehension and Math Fundamentals for Students Participating in Program 13+ Months Who Achieved Below a Month Per Month Gain F.Y. 1977-78, Matched Pre-Post Data

Institutions	Reading Comprehension			Math Fundamentals		
	No. of Students	Average Mo. in Program	Average G.P.M.	No. of Students	Average Mo. in Program	Average G.P.M.
F. C. Nelles	8	17	.06	8	16	.04
O. H. Close	15	20	-.01	15	22	.00
El Paso de Robles	7	22	-.01	7	22	.03
K. Holton	7	17	.04	11	18	.06
DeWitt Nelson	4	21	.03	2	25	.01
Preston	16	16	.04	13	17	.00
Y.T.S.	3	17	.06	Ø	--	--
Ventura	2	19	.01	Ø	--	--
N.R.C.C.	Ø	--	--	1	14	.04
S.R.C.C.	Ø	--	--	1	19	.00
TOTALS	62	19	.02	58	19	.02

with an average growth per month of .16 in Reading Comprehension. These students had an average program participation of 16 months. The 62 students who did not achieve a month per month growth rate were in program an average of 19 months and made a virtually zero growth rate (.02). (See Table 15.)

Eighty-three students participated in the Math program in excess of 12 months. Again, 30 percent of these students achieved at or above the month per month growth rate; the

average duration in program was 16 months with an average growth rate of .17 in the Math Fundamentals. The remaining 70 percent made a near zero growth rate of .02 and were in the Math program an average of 19 months. Table 15 displays the number of students, average months in program, and average gain per month rates for these students who performed below the month per month growth rate in reading and math.

The "zero-growth group" in reading and math was further analyzed by the ethnicity of the students. White, Spanish-Surnamed and Black students constitute 25, 24, and 51 percent respectively of the group of long-term students (who made below the month per month gain) in Reading, and 35, 21 and 44 percent respectively in Math. The ethnicity of the students on which the total achievement data (matched) was based was, in the case of Reading, 29, 24, and 43 percent White, Spanish-Surnamed and Black; and 35, 23, and 36 percent respectively in Math. The previous discussion on ethnicity and growth rates indicated that Black students (in certain pretest ranges) had lower growth rates than their counterparts. The disproportionate percentage of Black students in the "zero growth group," who were held in program in excess of 13 months is an important factor in these growth rate discrepancies.

Summary of Findings on Achievement Gains

The preceding discussion has provided the opportunity to review the impact of four selected factors (age, ethnicity, pretest score, and length of program participation) on achievement gains.

The age and ethnicity of the Compensatory Education students did not show statistically significant correlations with their achievement gains. It was discovered, however, that the youngest student who pretest very low or very high in Reading (in relation to their counterparts in the institutions) made smaller gains--a month for each month growth rate. The high pretesting (above 5.1) Black students also achieved less than the planned gain per month in the Reading program. In the Math Component, the high pretesting "Other" students made an average growth of less than .11 gain per month. All other students achieved at this level or above in Math Fundamentals.

The students in program for more than nine months did not achieve the required average growth rate of .11 gain per month. There were students in the program for more than nine months who made gains well over the .11 minimum growth rate requirement. However, there were many students, in both Reading and Math, who had virtually a zero growth rate.

Prior investigations have pointed to the relevance of pretest and length of program to grade level gains. It was the intent

of this section to go beyond these overall findings to locate specifics which could lend themselves to appropriate recommendations for program planners and classroom teachers. Recommendations are submitted in Chapter VI.

Evaluation Findings on the Career Awareness Component

Ventura School and the Youth Training School implemented a Career Awareness component during the 1977-78 Fiscal Year. The instruction concentrated on increasing career information and assessing the interests, abilities, and values of participants to motivate them to greater involvement in the acquisition of basic academic skills. There were 337 participants enrolled in the program at Ventura School and 130 at Y.T.S.

The impact of these career awareness activities has been partially measured by the use of career attitude questionnaires. Although student awareness of careers and their own personal interests have improved, staff members feel that the most remedial students who have the greatest needs in this area are the most difficult to reach with the traditional career awareness curriculum. At one school, the project coordinator indicated preference for an instructional process that emphasizes a values clarification approach.

Evaluation Findings on the Multicultural Education Component

The Multicultural Education component is a requirement in the ESEA, Title I Program in California. The State Department of Education regards this component as a way to assist students in understanding and appreciating differing cultural and ethnic styles, and in developing mature views about their own ethnicity.

This component addresses a difficult area of learning and all individuals who made efforts to help students interact more effectively deserve praise. The multicultural curriculum content and instructional methodology is still in developmental stages in the ESEA, Title I Program. The positive contribution the component makes toward students' growth has nevertheless been established by both the subjective impressions of program reviewers as well as by objective data.

In order to assist staff in assessing the attitudes of Youth Authority students and in developing curriculum to modify negative attitudes, a Multiethnic-Intergroup Awareness Questionnaire was developed.[2] This questionnaire uses specific, concrete, familiar concepts and allows the student to judge whether Whites, Blacks Chicanos, and Women make good neighbors, teachers, mayors, etc.

---

[2] See Appendix D.

Interpretation of responses produces measures of ethnic pride (perception of one's own ethnic group), of ethnocentrism (feelings of superiority about one's own ethnicity, with varying degrees of negativism regarding other ethnic groups), and of inter-ethnic prejudice.

A number of institutions used the Multi-Ethnic Intergroup Awareness Questionnaire on a pre-post basis in 1977-78 to measure the impact of multicultural instruction on the students. A total of 305 matched pre-post questionnaires were returned to the central office. Out of these, there were 111 White, 117 Black, and 77 Chicano respondents. The data was analyzed in a variety of ways to shed light on the pre-post changes. Tables 16-18 describe the results of this analysis.

The overall changes in ethnic pride were not dramatic, although in six schools there were sizeable changes. The percentage of students who responded in a less ethnocentric manner was more remarkable--one-third of the students answered the questionnaire items with non-ethnocentric responses at pretest time; almost one-half had non-ethnocentric responses at the time of the post-test (Table 16). When this data is viewed by ethnic groups (Table 17), the group that made the notable change in ethnic pride were the Black students. These students also had the most desirable responses on the pretest. The Black student group made good gains in non-ethnocentric attitudes as did the Chicano student group. The White student group made some improvements in this area.

TABLE 16

Changes in Ethnic Pride and Ethnocentrism of Participants in the Multicultural Education Component by Institution, 1977-78

Institutions	Percentage of Students with Balanced Ethnic Pride		Percentage of Students with Non Ethnocentric Attitudes	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
O. H. Close (64)[a]	59	59	42	42
K. Holton (16)	50	63	31	37
DeWitt Nelson (14)	71	79	21	43
Preston (49)	58	55	27	47
F. C. Nelles (77)	68	74	23	51
El Paso de Robles (13)	46	62	38	38
Ventura (28)	79	68	54	57
Y.T.S. (15)	40	67	20	40
N.R.C.C. (29)	72	86	41	45
TOTALS (305)	63	67	33	46

[a]Number of students with matched pre-post questionnaires.

TABLE 17

Changes in Attitudes by Ethnic Groups on Ethnic Pride and Ethnocentrism Total Pre-Post Matched Data, 1977-78

Ethnic Group of Responding Students	Percent of Students with Balanced Ethnic Pride		Percent of Students with Non-Ethnocentric Attitudes	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
White (111)[a]	66	67	42	48
Black (117)	73	84	41	57
Chicano (77)	52	54	18	36
Totals (305)	63	67	33	46

[a]Number of students with matched pre-post questionnaires.

Table 18 shows the changes in attitudes towards specific ethnic groups. Black and Chicano students moved to notably more unprejudiced position towards Whites; Chicanos to better attitudes towards Blacks; Whites and Blacks to better attitudes towards Chicanos. The pretest data for White and Black students shows little prejudice towards women and the change was to an even more positive position.

This data indicates progress in the area of multicultural-intergroup education, and is even more impressive when viewed from the perspective that ethnic perceptions are not easily changed in an incarcerated population which tends to insularize and polarize itself into groups along ethnic lines.

TABLE 18

Changes in Inter-Ethnic Intergroup Prejudice by Ethnic Group Total Pre-Post Matched Data, 1977-78

Ethnic Group of Responding Students	Percent of Students Unprejudiced							
	Towards Whites		Towards Blacks		Towards Chicanos		Towards Women	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
White (111)[a]			47	50	52	64	87	95
Black (117)	58	70			48	61	85	91
Chicano (77)	32	42	27	40			63	65

[a]Number of students with matched pre-post questionnaires.

Evaluation Findings on Staff Development

Staff members from the ten institutions participated in a variety of training experiences during 1977-78 Fiscal Year. The reported training is displayed in Table 19. The four training areas most

TABLE 19

Number and Percent of Staff Training by Training Area

Training Area	Total		Staff Receiving Training									
			Project Coordinator		Teachers		Teaching Aides		School Psych.		Clerical	
Conference related to:	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Reading	17	6			9	8	7	8	1	3		
Math	7	3			3	3	3	4	1	3		
Language	8	3			3	3	5	5				
Multicultural	46	16	5	22	19	16	14	15	5	13	3	16
Career Awareness	7	2			4	3	2	2	1	3		
Conferences on:												
Learning Disabilities	33	11	4	17	11	9	9	10	6	16	3	16
Testing & Evaluation	2	1					1	1			1	5
Classroom Management	13	4			5	4	7	8	1	3		
Institutional/Ward Management	35	12	2	9	18	15	11	12	3	8	1	5
General Education Conferences	24	8			10	8	10	11	3	8	1	5
Program Visitations	10	3			5	4	4	4	1	3		
Other Training:												
Inservice	41	14	2	9	22	18	6	7	4	11	7	37
Personal Development	15	5			3	8	8	9	2	4	2	11
Orientation to ESEA Guidelines	12	4			5	4	4	4	2	4	1	5
ESEA, Title I application Workshop	19	7	10	43	2	2			7	19		
Clerical Training	1	1							1	3		
Total Training Experience	290	100	23	100	119	100	91	100	38	100	19	100

frequently cited were multicultural, inservice training, institutional and ward management, and learning disabilities. Table 19 shows staff in differing classifications and the percentage of training received.

Participating staff recommended that staff development should also include training in student motivation and additional emphasis on visitations to other Youth Authority school programs.

It has been reported by the project supervisors at the ten institutions that the participating staff routinely provided feedback on their impressions of the training to the supervisors. No objective data on staff perceptions of the training was provided to the central office enabling institutional or program wide conclusions on the effectiveness of training.

Several schools gathered data by the Classroom Assessment Inventory[3] to provide information on the perception of students as they evaluated their teachers on several dimensions. This useful information, however, cannot be directly related to the effectiveness of the training experiences of the staff because of the lack of pretraining and post-training data on students' perceptions of their teachers. The inventory will continue to be used to provide feedback to teachers and administrators on the response of students to classroom management, motivational climate, and student attitudes towards the instructional setting.

---

[3] See Appendix E.

Chapter IV

PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION: CONCERNS AND ACTIVITIES

Project Funding

The funding level of Title I, ESEA for Youth Authority school programs has remained the same for several years although inflationary costs for personnel and operating expenses have been increasing. Further, changes in school population have affected the number of eligible students in individual schools resulting in inequities in existing disbursement of Title I, ESEA monies. State support programs have been modified in some instances. All of these factors have resulted in the need to look at alternative funding methods which will allocate funds for supplementary program on the basis of current conditions.

Management has been focusing on plans which take into consideration the number of eligible students in each school's population and which will maximize the use of resources for the most educationally disadvantaged students.

Legal Compliance Monitoring

The legal structure within which ESEA Title I programs must function for delivery of supplementary services to the State's education effort within the Youth Authority is diligently explained and

monitored by the central office ESEA Title I administrators. Each institution complies with the regulations on an ongoing basis. Appendix B to this report contains a checklist used for monitoring purposes. Any irregularities exposed by the monitoring visits are modified according to the established legal compliance standards.

Evaluation Monitoring

Like the previous years, each institutional Compensatory Education Program specified the evaluation plans for each component during the 1977-78 program year. A monitoring form (Appendix C) was used by the central office evaluation staff to ensure that evaluation of program components took place as planned. The monitoring information that became available served not only the purpose of an accountability tool, but also as an aid in registering concerns and difficulties when planned components were translated into practice. Written feedback and recommendations were provided to each school to sustain or correct certain procedures to best achieve the evaluation standards.

Technical Assistance

Besides monitoring for legal and evaluation purposes, the central office staff provided ongoing technical assistance throughout the program year. The development of local applications for grants is a complex process for which assistance is provided. The evaluation

data on program components flowed into the central office from the field on a continuous basis. This data was transformed into meaningful and concise formats, and shared with the relevant institutional staff as ongoing feedback on component performance. The interpretation of evaluative data for the benefit of program implementers was an integral part of the technical assistance in the area of evaluation.

The component of multicultural education at all institutions received special attention from the central office Ethnic Studies Specialists throughout the project year. The efforts of these specialists, the teaching staff and the evaluation staff, aided by the support of administrators, both central office and institutional, brought more clarity and structure into this area of instruction.

Chapter V

SIGNIFICANCE OF COMPENSATORY EDUCATION IN THE YOUTH AUTHORITY

The mandate to serve the "neediest of the needy" delinquents in Youth Authority is a challenge to teaching staff and program supervisors. The improvement of reading and math skills of those students who have poor study habits and skills, and function at grade levels considerably below age-grade expectancies requires careful planning, various methodologies, and dedication.

The analysis of data relative to the program impact shows, nevertheless, that student average gains, assessed through the various subtests of the Test for Adult Basic Education (TABE), range from satisfactory to excellent. The aggregate data yielded the results shown in Table 20. All subtests show better than month per month gains. These data attest to the fact that the supplemental contribution of ESEA Title I effort within the Youth Authority Education Program is helping the students achieve academic growth unprecedented in their earlier public school educational experiences. Additionally, most of the ESEA Title I projects have aimed at and accomplished functional literacy for many participants in the areas of reading, language, and math.

TABLE 20

Average Gain Per Month Scores on Subtests of TABE
F.Y. 1977-78 Aggregate, Matched Pre-Post Data

Subtest	No. of Students	Gain Per Month
Vocabulary	969	.11
Comprehension	966	.14
English Mechanics	419	.11
Spelling	547	.12
Reasoning (Math)	953	.15
Fundamentals (Math)	951	.16

During the 1977-78 year, each school's ESEA Title I Program included a multicultural/intergroup education component. The focus of this component is to impart factual information and knowledge as well as provide activities aimed at modifying attitudes in this critical area of intergroup relations. Attitudes of students relative to ethnicity and women show trends toward improvement as a result of multicultural/intergroup instruction. Inasmuch as a repertoire of healthy and mature attitudes enriches the personal and interpersonal lives of youth, Compensatory Education has made a significant contribution to one dimension of that repertoire.

Chapter VI

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In this chapter, only those findings will be given that signify the need for a recommendation. Therefore, many noteworthy observations are omitted and the reader is asked to refer to the appropriate chapters of this report if interested in additional information. Although the conclusions are based on the 1977-78 data, recommendations are applicable to subsequent program years.

Institutional Achievement Objectives

Conclusion #1.0

Three schools met all their stated objectives for the reading, language and math components. Other schools met or exceeded their objectives in one or two of the components.

Recommendation #1.0

Schools that state achievement objectives above the minimum requirement of more than a month's grade level gain per month in program and do not meet those stated objectives should consider more realistic and conservative objectives.

Recommendation #1.1

Those schools that greatly exceeded their stated objectives should consider raising the level of expected outcomes. Optimum staff effort results when the expectation is neither too low nor too high.

Recommendation #1.2

Those programs that did not meet the minimum level of .11 grade levels gain per month should be reviewed in terms of the diagnostic-prescriptive process, instructional methodology, program activities, staff-student ratios and the supplementary nature of the Title I component. Staff training should be arranged in areas found to be inadequate.

Age and Grade Level Growth Rates

Conclusions #2.0

Although the variable of age showed no relationship with gain per month rates (aggregate data), the youngest students (age 13-15) with pretest scores of 1.0-3.0 and 5.1+ were the only group which did not achieve an average gain of .11 in Reading Comprehension. Their gain scores in reading were not severely depressed, and the differential is small; attention is drawn to these groups since they did not meet the minimum requirement.

Recommendation #2.0

The youngest students in the reading program who pretest at the 1.0-3.0 and 5.1+ levels should be closely monitored in their program progress.

Ethnicity and Growth Rates

Conclusion #3.0

All students, except the 189 Black students in the 5.1+ pretest range, achieved an average gain of more than one month in Reading Comprehension. Forty-seven (47) "Other" students in the 5.1+ pretest range were the only participants achieving an average of less than a month per month growth rate in Math Fundamentals.

Recommendation #3.0

Although these findings reflect other factors than ethnicity, the learning problems of each individual student should be addressed and individual program adjustments made on an ongoing basis.

Pretest Scores and Growth Rates

Conclusion #4.0

Pretest scores are negatively correlated with growth rates.

Recommendation #4.0

Reading and Math objectives should be stated differentially for pretest ranges of students. The data indicates a practical division at the 1.0-5.0 and 5.1 plus levels.

The expected outcomes would be more realistic and provide more appropriate feedback to teaching staff. Success or failure to achieve program objectives could be weighed in the light of the average pretest level of a particular classroom and assessment

could focus on the capability of program activities to meet the needs of students at different pretest levels.

Length of Program Participation and Growth Rates

Conclusion #5.0

Students who were in program in excess of twelve months did not achieve the required average grade level growth rate of .11 months per months in program. One-third (31 in reading, 25 in math) of these students achieved above the month per month growth rate (.16 and .17, respectively in reading and math) and had an average program participation of 16 months. The remaining two-thirds of the long-term students averaged 19 months in program and made a virtually zero growth rate (.02 per month of participation).

Recommendation #5.0

Those students needing remedial instruction, who are retained in program for lengths of time in excess of twelve months, should be monitored for progress on an ongoing and individual basis. The causes of lack of progress should be determined by the careful judgment of the school psychologist and teachers. If in their judgment, the student can no longer profit from the supplementary services of Title I, he/she should be removed from participation in a specific component area on a temporary or even permanent basis.

Career Awareness

Conclusion #6.0

Some remedial students in Career Awareness programs have difficulty with the traditional career awareness instructional approaches because of their limited motivation to consider their future careers.

Recommendation #6.0

In order that remedial students participating in career awareness activities be given the opportunity to improve their knowledge and attitudes towards the world of work and be motivated to explore their own personal occupational interests, new approaches should be explored. Elemental to motivation to consider the future as well as the "here and now" is the clarification of one's values. Among those students who are at the remedial level, there are students who can conceptualize quite well about their values and their futures. These students should be used to assist their less able peers in individual and group sessions.

Multicultural/Intergroup Instructions

Conclusion #7.0

Participant perception of their own and other ethnic groups and women improved as measured by the pre-post administration of the Multiethnic Intergroup Awareness Questionnaire. These positive trends are based on aggregated institutional data. The limited number of matched pre-post questionnaires provided by some programs make individual institutional assessment spurious.

Recommendation #7.0

The reliability of evaluation depends upon the quality and quantity of data upon which findings are based. Special efforts should be made to ensure more matched pre-post data from institutional programs.

Recommendation #7.1

Positive changes in ethnic and intergroup perceptions are predicated upon a relevant, planned and balanced curriculum which is presented to students in an organized, meaningful manner. Each institution should review the ESEA supplementary activities of the Multicultural component to assure that they are at the level of sophistication of the other Compensatory Education components.

Staff Development

Conclusion #8.0

Although staff members routinely provide feedback on their training experiences to local project supervisors, no objective data is available on staff perceptions of training.

Recommendation #8.0

Staff training experiences should have positive impact on program, on students, and, of course, on the staff members themselves. The perceptions of students can be measured by such instruments as the Classroom Assessment Inventory II. If an appropriately designed needs assessment instrument is used annually (at the

time that the staff development component is being planned), this would indicate changes in staff needs and assist in determining effectiveness of training received during the fiscal year.

References

ANNUAL REPORTS
COMPENSATORY EDUCATION IN YOUTH AUTHORITY

1967-68 Seckel, Joachim. Annual Evaluation of Compensatory Education in the California Youth Authority, 1969.

1968-69 Seckel, Joachim and Webb, Mannie. Evaluation Summary of Compensatory Education in the California Youth Authority, 1970.

1969-70 Ferdun, Gareth and Webb, Mannie. Compensatory Education in the California Youth Authority, 1970.

1970-71 Ferdun, Gareth, et. al. Compensatory Education Program Description and Evaluation, 1971.

1971-72 _____. Compensatory Education Program Description and Evaluation, 1972.

1972-73 _____. Compensatory Education Program Description and Evaluation, 1974.

1973-74 Mahan, JoAnn, et. al. Compensatory Education Program Description and Evaluation, 1975.

1974-75 _____. Compensatory Education Program Description and Evaluation, 1976.

1975-76 _____. Compensatory Education Program Description and Evaluation, 1977.

1976-77 _____. Compensatory Education Program Description and Evaluation, 1978.

CALIFORNIA YOUTH AUTHORITY
EDUCATION RESEARCH SERIES REPORTS

1. Seckel, Joachim. Interim Assessment of the Jobs Related to Training Project, 1970.

2. Mahan, JoAnn and Andre, Carl. Progress Report on the Differential Education Project, 1971.

3. Ferdun, Gareth. Employment, Education and Violation Experience of Wards Aides, 1971.

4. Woodring, Thomas and Ferdun, Gareth. A Preliminary Study of Reading Achievement in the Youth Authority, 1971.

5. Ferdun, Gareth. The Relationship Between Selected Educational and Demographic Variables, 1971.

6. Webb, Mannie. Reading and Recidivism, 1971.

7. Mahan, JoAnn and Andre, Carl. Second Year Report on the Differential Education Project, 1971.

8. Ferdun, Gareth. Two-Factor Classroom Environment Scale, 1972.

9. Guttman, Lynn and Ferdun, Gareth. School Attendance and Recidivism for the Santa Clara Liaison Project, 1972.

10. Ferdun, Gareth. Facts and Artifacts, 1972.

11. Mahan, JoAnn and Andre, Carl. A Final Report on the Differential Education Project, 1972.

12. Ferdun, Gareth and Lockard, Howard. Jobs Related to Training, Final Report, 1973.

13. Ferdun, Gareth. Evaluation Questionnaires in Use Within the CYA Education Section, 1973.

OTHER REFERENCES

Annual Report, Program Description and Statistical Summary, Department of the Youth Authority, 1978.

Davis, George, et. al. Characteristics of California Youth Authority Wards, December 31, 1978. California Youth Authority Information Systems.

Mahan, JoAnn and Bal, Amarjit, "Measurement of Inter-ethnic Intergroup Perceptions of Youth Authority Students," Youth Authority Quarterly, Spring, 1978.

Appendices

DESCRIPTION OF ESEA TITIE I *Reading*
COMPONENT VARIATIONS BY SCHOOL
F.Y. 1977-78

School	Selection Criteria	No. of Students Served	No. of Hours Per Week	No. of Students Participating in Non-Federal Classes 5-15 Hrs.	15 + Hrs.	Duration of Component Per Participant	Average Student Age	Student/ Staff Ratio	Instructional Staff Fed.	Non-Fed	Principal Instructional Method
O.H. Close	Under 6.5 on total reading	135	4-5		135	Until paroled or over 6.5 in total reading	16.5	7:1	4½ TA 12 Ward Aides	7 Tch. 3/4-F 1/4	Ward aide and TA tutoring prescribed individualized instruction
Karl Holton	Reading Comp.6.5 or below	98	5		98	Until Reading Comp. score of 10.0 or paroled or H.S. grad or 21 years	18.5	6:1	1 Tch. 1 TA	1 Tch.	Individualized instruction
DeWitt Nelson	Under 6.0 read. comp.	70	6		70	To 6.0 Read Comp.	19.6	3:1	½ Tch. 1½ Tch		Lab Individual Inst
Fred C. Nelles	Under 6.0 grade level in total reading	144	2		144	Until reach 7.0 in total reading	16½		1 Tch. 1 CPA ½ CPA ½ Clerk Ward Aides Vols.		Individualized
Preston	Under 8.0 in reading	103	1-3			Until 8.0 in reading (Mean=7 mo.)	18.5	7.5:1 9.5:1	1½ Tch 1 TA		Individualized instruction diagnostic prescriptive system
El Paso de Robles	6.0 in reading comp. neediest of needy	110	2		25(110)	7.0 or paroled	17.6	2:1	2 TA 4 Ward Aides	12 Tch. 1 TA 4Ward Aides 4 Vols.	Lab individual instruction
Ventura	Below 7th grade reading level as determined by TABE	45	4		45 16	When student reaches 8th grade level in comp.	18	5:1	1 Tch. 2 TA 2 Ward Aides		ALC, individual reading prescription
Y.T.S.	YTS Ranking system basically 6.0 and under	120	4		120	7.0 months	18.3	6:1	2 Tchs. 1 CPA		ALC, diagnostic/ prescriptive
N.R.C.C.	Cheyenne & Wintu students who need remediation and institutional staff	60	5		60		16.8	6:1	1 TA ½ Vol.	2 Tch.	Individual instruction
S.R.C.C.	2 or more grades below age grade norms by priority of need	30	2	20 20		2½ weeks 5 months	18	6:1	½ Tchs 1 TA	1 Tch. 1 Vol.	Individual instruction

DESCRIPTION OF ESEA TITLE I Math
COMPONENT VARIATIONS BY SCHOOL
F.Y. 1977-78

School	Selection Criteria	No. of Students Served	No. of Hours Per Week	No. of Students Participating in Non-Federal Classes 5-15 Hrs.	15 + Hrs.	Duration of Component Per Participant	Average Student Age	Student/ Staff Ratio	Instructional Staff Fed.	Non-Fed	Principal Instructional Method
O.H. Close	Below 7.5 in either of math subtests lowest selected	220/30	4/2		220/30	Until paroled or over 7.5 in both subtests	16.5	8:1	4½ TA 12Ward Aides	7Tchs. 3/4-F ¼	Ward aides and TA tutoring prescribed individualized instruction.
Karl Holton	6.5 or below in LRC / 6.5-9.9 in IRC	98/49	5/5-10	98/49		Until reading comp. score of 10.0 or paroled or H.S. grad or 21 years	18.5/18.5	6:1/7:1	1 Tch. 1 ½ TA	1 Tch. 1 Tch. 1 TA	Individual instruction IMTS
DeWitt Nelson	Under 6.0 total math	70	6		70	To 6.0 total math or paroled	19:6	3:1	½ Tch. 1 ½ TA		Lab individual instruction EDL mind strathmore
Fred C. Nelles	Under 6.0 in total math	72	2		72	Until reach 7.0 in total math	16½	12:1	1 Tch. ½ CPA 2 Vols 1/3 Clerk		Individualized
Preston	Under 8.0 in math	53/78	1-3/3 more			Until 8.0 in reading (Mean = 7 mo.)	18.5	8.1:1/8.1:1	1½ Tch. 1 TA		Individualized instruction/Diagnostic/Prescriptive System
El Paso de Robles	6.0 score and neediest of the needy	110	2		25 hrs. (9)	7.0 or paroled	17.6	2:1	2 TA 4Ward Aides	12 Tchs. 1 TA 4 Ward Aides 4 Vols.	Lab individual instruction
Ventura	Below age/gr. expectancy in math as determined by TABE	37/15/52	4/3		37/15/52	Within 1 year expectancy indicated on the TABE	18	5:1	1Tch. 2 TA 3 Ward Aides		IMT System Prescribed Study (individual)
Y.T.S.	Ranking System	108	4		108	6.5 months	18.2	9:1	1Tch.		IMTS and Holt Program (Diag/Pres.)
N.R.C.C.	Are in need of instruction for high school	60	5		60		16.8	6:1	1 TA ¼ Vols	2Tchs.	Individual instruction
S.R.C.C.	2 grades or more below age grade norms by priority of needs	30/20	10	20/20		2½ weeks / 5 months	18	6:1	½ Tch. 1 TA	1 Tch. 1 Ward Aid 1 Vol.	Individual instruction

DESCRIPTION OF ESEA TITLE I *Language Development*
COMPONENT VARIATIONS BY SCHOOL
F.Y. 1977-78

School	Selection Criteria	No. of Students Served	No. of Hours Per Week	No. of Students Participating in Non-Federal Classes 5-15 Hrs.	15 + Hrs.	Duration of Component Per Participant	Average Student Age	Student/ Staff Ratio	Instructional Staff Fed.	Non-Fed	Principal Instructional Method
O.H. Close	5.6-8.5 on total reading selected on teacher availability	86	4-5		46	Until paroled or over 8.5 in all 4 /LD subtests	16.5	7:1	4½ TA 12 Ward Aides	7 Tch 3/4-F 1/4	Ward aides and TA tutoring prescribed individualized instruction
Karl Holton	Reading comp. score 6.5-9.9	49	5-10	49		Until reading comp. score of 10.0 or paroled or H.S. grad or 21 years	18.5	7:1	2 TA	1 Tch.	Individual Instruction IMTS
DeWitt Nelson	6.0 to 8.0 read comp.	70	6		70	To 8.0 read.comp. or parole	19.6	5:1	1 Tch. 1½ TA		Communication skills relevent to world of work vocabulary
Fred C. Nelles	Between 3.5 and 7.5 in total reading	72	2		72	Until reach 8.0 in total reading	16½	12:1	1 Tch. ½ CPA 1/3 Clerk 2 Vols.		Individualized
Preston											
El Paso de Robles											
Ventura	Below age/gr. expectancy in language development as determined by TABE	17	2		17	Within 1 year of age/gr. expectancy as indicated on the TABE	18	5:1	1 Tch. 2 TA 1 Ward Aides		IMT system prescribed study schedule (individual)
Y.T.S.											
N.R.C.C.											
S.R.C.C.											

DESCRIPTION OF ESEA TITLE I Multicultural Education
COMPONENT VARIATIONS BY SCHOOL
F.Y. 1977-78

School	Selection Criteria	No. of Students Served	No. of Hours Per Week	No. Of Students Participating in Non-Federal Classes 5-15 Hrs.	15 + Hrs.	Duration of Component Per Participant	Average Student Age	Student/ Staff Ratio	Instructional Staff Fed.	Non-Fed	Principal Instructional Method
O.H. Close	Title I Participants	255	1		255	Untiled paroled	17.0	17:1	½ MCE Cord.	7Tchs.	Inquiry discussion
Karl Holton	Title I participants	17 17	10 6	17 17		5-10 high school credits	18.5 18.5	17:1 17:1		1 Tch.	Inquiry and discussion
DeWitt Nelson	Title I participant	70	1		70	Untiled paroled or eneligible	19.6	4.5	2 Tchs 3 TA		Inquiry discussion
Fred C. Nelles	All participants selected for other component	200	2	200		Untiled paroled	16½	16:1	1/3 Clerk ¼ CPA	6 Tchs	Group inquiry
Preston	All Title I participants	(Same as reading and Math)				During enrollment in Title I classes (unit covered 30 days)	18.5		1½ Tch. 1 TA		Audio-visual and group process
El Paso de Robles	Everyone in reading and math	110	1		25 (hrs)	When out of math and reading	17.6	2:1	2 TA 4 Ward Aides		
Ventura	All participants		1		All participants	Until dropped from program	18	12:1			Visual aids discussion
Y.T.S.		200	1	2	200		18.2	3 Tchs. 1 CPA			Films individual study
N.R.C.C.	Graduation	10	5		10	6 weeks now should change to 10 weeks	16.8	6:1	1 TA	1 Tch.	Group instruction heavy multi-media
S.R.C.C.	2 or more grades below norms by priority of needs	30 20	1 1	20 20		2½ weeks 5 months	18	15:1 6:1		1 Tch.	Audio visual presentation followed by discussion

DESCRIPTION OF ESEA TITLE I *Career Awareness*
COMPONENT VARIATIONS BY SCHOOL
F.Y. 1977-78

School	Selection Criteria	No. of Students Served	No. of Hours Per Week	No. of Students Participating in Non-Federal Classes 5-15 Hrs.	15 + Hrs.	Duration of Component Per Participant	Average Student Age	Student/ Staff Ratio	Instructional Staff Fed.	Non-Fed	Principal Instructional Method
O.H. Close											
Karl Holton											
DeWitt Nelson											
Fred C. Nelles											
Preston											
El Paso de Robles											
Ventura	*Same as Math/ Lang. Reading Indiv. interest Prep. to parole*	*Phase I 88 Phase II 115 Phase III*	*2 hrs 2 hrs 4 hrs*		*88 15 6*	*7 weeks 7 weeks 4 weeks*	*18*	*8:1 8:1 8:1*	*1 Tch*		*Counseling Guidance Visual Aids Reference Materials*
Y.T.S.		*108*	*4*		*108*	*2 months*	*18.2*	*6:1*	*1 CPA*	*1 Tch.*	*Singer Graflex Mini Xerox*
N.R.C.C.											
S.R.C.C.											

Appendix B

ESEA, TITLE I LEGAL COMPLIANCE
MONITORING CHECKLIST

Name of Institution: Date: (Check appropriate monitoring period)

Approved Components:

Reading _____ Career Education _____ Bi-Monthly _____
Language Dev. _____ Staff Development _____ Quarterly _____
Math _____ Annual _____
Multicultural _____

	Yes	No
I. STATE EFFORT		
A. Is there visible State effort for each component? (If yes, describe by component)	_____	_____
B. Are all Title I services completely supplementary?	_____	_____
COMMENTS:		
II. NEEDS ASSESSMENT		
A. Is the Needs Assessment current and adequate?	_____	_____
COMMENTS:		
III. ESEA, TITLE I ELIGIBLES AND PARTICIPANTS		
Number of eligibles in population _____		
Number of ESEA, Title I participants _____		
A. Are all eligibles ranked?	_____	_____
B. Is the record of ESEA eligibles current?	_____	_____
C. Is the record of ESEA participants current?	_____	_____
D. Obtain a roster of all individuals participating in an ESEA activity:	_____	_____
1. Are all of the individuals eligible?	_____	_____
2. Are all of the individuals on the participant roster?	_____	_____
3. Do all of the individuals meet the selection criteria specified in the application?	_____	_____
COMMENTS:		

CONTINUED

1 OF 2

IV. EQUIPMENT AND PROPERTY	Yes	No
A. Has an equipment utilization system been established which includes:		
1. A complete list of all Title I equipment, showing date of acquisition, cost, location?	____	____
2. Any changes in the before-the-fact schedule of daily assignment to Title I activities?	____	____
3. Is an annual inventory of equipment on file showing location, acquisition date and cost, plus copies of documents verifying items that have been purchased, surveyed or otherwise removed from the inventory during the past year, and submitted to the supervisor of Compensatory Education each March?	____	____
B. Are all items purchased with Title I funds, except supplies, included in the inventory?	____	____
C. Are justifications and documents for Title I equipment purchases in compliance with State regulations and ESEA guidelines?	____	____
D. Identify 1/4 of all ESEA property and check location, labeling, usage, and condition.	____	____
(Check different items each monitoring period)		
1. Are the items all located?	____	____
_____ _____		
_____ _____		
_____ _____		
2. Are the items all labeled?	____	____
3. Are all items used only by ESEA participants and/or ESEA staff?	____	____
List items used by non-ESEA participants and non-ESEA staff.		
_____ _____		
_____ _____		
_____ _____		
4. Are all items properly maintained?	____	____
E. Identify all new property and equipment received during the last two months.		
1. Can all items be located?	____	____
2. Are all items labeled with date of purchase?	____	____

	Yes	No
E. (Continued)		
3. Are all items to be used only by ESEA staff/wards?	____	____
4. Are all items in operating condition?	____	____

	Number
G. Identify all items dropped from the ESEA inventory in the last two months.	
1. Number of items dropped from inventory	____

List:	Item	Reason
	_____	_____
	_____	_____
	_____	_____

V. FISCAL MANAGEMENT

	Changed	Unchanged
Title I funds budgeted for each component. (Enter amounts at the start of the program year and only report changes in funding during the year.)		
Language Development _____	____	____
Reading _____	____	____
Mathematics _____	____	____
Staff Development _____	____	____
Multicultural Education _____	____	____
Bilingual Education _____	____	____
Educational Development _____	____	____
Title I cost per participant _____		

	Yes	No
A. Is there proper documentation of all Title I expenditures?	____	____
1. Approved training plans	____	____
2. Travel expense claims?	____	____
3. Purchase Orders?	____	____
B. Is budget information received on a regular basis?	____	____
C. Has there been an increase or reduction in the number of State-funded education positions:	____	____
If yes, identify:		
D. Has there been an increase or decrease in the State education operating budget?	____	____
If yes, identify:		

	Yes	No
VI. PERSONNEL		
A. Are all authorized ESEA, Title I positions filled?	_____	
B. Are there current duty statements for all ESEA, Title I personnel?	_____	
VII. TRAINING, ORIENTATION & ADVISORY COMMITTEES		
A. Have any new ESEA staff been added during the last two months? How many? _____	_____	
B. If yes, have they received orientation on laws, guidelines, regulations and branch policy relating to ESEA, Title I?	_____	
If not, why not?		
C. Interview new staff members; does their knowledge (B above) appear adequate?	_____	
D. Have any training activities been provided for ESEA staff during the last two months?	_____	
E. Has any ESEA-funded training been conducted during the last two months?	_____	
F. If yes, were any non-ESEA staff included in the training?	_____	
G. If yes, could the training have been provided with less cost if non-ESEA staff had not been involved?	_____	
H. Was the training activity included in an approved training plan?	_____	
1. Describe follow-up or other extension		
I. Has the ESEA Advisory Committee met during the last quarter?	_____	
If not, why not?		
1. Was a fiscal officer in attendance?	_____	
Are minutes of the meeting available?	_____	
VIII. BUILDING MODIFICATIONS OR CONSTRUCTION		
A. Are there plans for ESEA, Title I construction or building modification this year?	_____	
B. Is construction or modification underway?	_____	
C. If "A" or "B" is yes, have there been proper approvals?	_____	

	Yes	No
IX. PROJECT DESIGN		
A. Has there been a change in program activities as described in the application	____	____
B. If "A" is yes, are there approved amendments or revisions?	____	____
X. ESEA STAFF TIME		
A. Has Form YA 5.200 been filled out on all ESEA employees?	____	____
B. Are all forms complete?	____	____
C. Do all of the forms for fully funded ESEA employees show work only on ESEA?	____	____
D. Do all of the forms for fractionally funded ESEA staff show that they are spending an appropriate amount of time on ESEA?	____	____
E. Are Forms YA 5.200 filed for permanent reference?	____	____
F. Has copy of last monthly time report been sent to the supervisor of Compensatory Education Program?	____	____
G. Interview two ESEA staff members (different staff each time)		
1. Are there any tasks that either has performed under ESEA in the last month which they feel may not be ESEA responsibilities?	____	____
If yes, list: _____		
_____		
_____		
2. Are there any tasks that either has performed under ESEA in the last month which you feel may not be ESEA responsibility?	____	____
If yes, list: _____		
_____		
_____		

_____ _____

Signature of Monitor Date

Appendix C

PROGRAM EVALUATION REVIEW RECORD

School _____ Monitor _____

Component(s) _____ Date _____

_____

1. Measurement Instrument OR Technique Used: _____

2. Administration of Measurement Instrument (or Technique).

   a) Who administers? Pre _____

   Post _____

   b) When last administered? _____

   c) Who took the test or questionnaire? _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

   d) Any difficulties with the administration of the questionnaire (test administrator's problems, student problems)?

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

3. Adequacy of measurement used.

a) Properly measures objectives? Yes _____ No _____

If "No," explain: _____

_____

_____

b) Allows for adequate identification of student, e.g., pre-post, date, name, ethnicity, class? Yes ____ No _____

If "No," explain: _____

_____

_____

c) Suggestions for improvement of measurement: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

4. Data analysis.

a) Who analyzes data? _____

_____

b) Is analysis adequate? _____

_____

c) Is information used for formative assessment? _____

_____

d) Suggestions for improvement of analysis: _____

_____

_____

_____

5. Suggested action.

a) Person responsible: _____

b) Action to be taken: _____

_____

_____

c) Completion date: _____

6. Summary or additional remarks.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

120277

Appendix D

Form A

MULTI-ETHNIC INTERGROUP AWARENESS QUESTIONNAIRE
ANSWER SHEET

Name _____ YA#: _____ Sex: Male ___

Class _____ Age: _____ Female ___

Today's Date: _____

Ethnic Group: (Circle One) White, Black, Chicano
Native American, Japanese
Mexican American, Chinese
Other: _____

STUDENTS: DO NOT WRITE IN THIS SPACE

Pre ☐

Post ☐

School _____

ESEA Participant ☐ Non-ESEA ☐

I.D.#: _____

MEIAQ Administrator's Name _____

Statements	White	Black	Chicano	Women
1. Make good neighbors.	All Most Some Few None	All Most Some Few None	All Most Some Few None	All Most Some Few None
2. Make good teachers.	All Most Some Few None	All Most Some Few None	All Most Some Few None	All Most Some Few None
3. Like good music.	All Most Some Few None	All Most Some Few None	All Most Some Few None	All Most Some Few None
4. Are good mayors and governors.	All Most Some Few None	All Most Some Few None	All Most Some Few None	All Most Some Few None
5. Are good to do business with.	All Most Some Few None	All Most Some Few None	All Most Some Few None	All Most Some Few None
6. Make good athletes.	All Most Some Few None	All Most Some Few None	All Most Some Few None	All Most Some Few None
7. Are likely to get in trouble with the law.	All Most Some Few None	All Most Some Few None	All Most Some Few None	All Most Some Few None
8. Are smart.	All Most Some Few None	All Most Some Few None	All Most Some Few None	All Most Some Few None
9. Are kind.	All Most Some Few None	All Most Some Few None	All Most Some Few None	All Most Some Few None

Form A
MULTI-ETHNIC INTERGROUP AWARENESS QUESTIONNAIRE

I.D.# _____

Statements	White	Black	Chicano	Women
10. Are easy to understand when they talk.	All Most Some Few None	All Most Some Few None	All Most Some Few None	All Most Some Few None
11. Are careful with their money.	All Most Some Few None	All Most Some Few None	All Most Some Few None	All Most Some Few None
12. Can be trusted.	All Most Some Few None	All Most Some Few None	All Most Some Few None	All Most Some Few None
13. Are handsome/beautiful.	All Most Some Few None	All Most Some Few None	All Most Some Few None	All Most Some Few None
14. Feel sorry for themselves.	All Most Some Few None	All Most Some Few None	All Most Some Few None	All Most Some Few None
15. Get along well with other ethnic groups.	All Most Some Few None	All Most Some Few None	All Most Some Few None	All Most Some Few None
16. Can be counted upon.	All Most Some Few None	All Most Some Few None	All Most Some Few None	All Most Some Few None
17. Want something for nothing.	All Most Some Few None	All Most Some Few None	All Most Some Few None	All Most Some Few None
18. Are honest.	All Most Some Few None	All Most Some Few None	All Most Some Few None	All Most Some Few None

DO NOT WRITE BELOW THIS LINE

TN ____	TN ____	TN ____	TN ____	TN ____
$\bar{X}$ = _____	$\bar{X}$ = _____	$\bar{X}$ = _____	$\bar{X}$ = _____	$\bar{X}$ = _____
EPI. = _____	ML = _____	ML = _____	ML = _____	ML = _____

Appendix E

School _____ How Long in Class _____

Class _____ Teaching Staff _____

Date _____ _____

Ethnic Group _____ _____

CLASSROOM ASSESSMENT INVENTORY II

We would like to find out how you feel about this class. The answers you give might help improve your Youth Authority education.

Please answer the following questions about this class only.

Please check (or mark) the most correct answer.

In this class, the teaching staff...	Mostly I Agree 1	Mostly I Don't Agree 2	
1. encourage me to do my best.	☐	☐	Col (1)
2. really help me learn.	☐	☐	Col (2)
3. don't make classwork interesting. .	☐	☐	Col (3)
4. help me feel better about my ethnic group and/or culture.	☐	☐	Col (4)
5. are willing to admit their mistakes.	☐	☐	Col (5)
6. are not fair.	☐	☐	Col (6)
7. make sure I understand my classwork.	☐	☐	Col (7)
8. want me to say what I think.	☐	☐	Col (8)
9. get too upset about too many things.	☐	☐	Col (9)
10. treat me like I am not important. .	☐	☐	Col (10)
11. don't teach me many things I can use when I leave here.	☐	☐	Col (11)
12. help me to think for myself.	☐	☐	Col (12)
13. try to understand the students in this class.	☐	☐	Col (13)

CLASSROOM ASSESSMENT INVENTORY II (Continued)

In this class, the teaching staff...	Mostly I Agree 1	Mostly I Don't Agree 2	
14. really know a lot about this subject.	☐	☐	Col (14)
15. test us about things which are not taught in this class.	☐	☐	Col (15)
16. like us to talk about what we are studying.	☐	☐	Col (16)
17. give me a lot of boring classwork. .	☐	☐	Col (17)
18. say nice things when I do good work.	☐	☐	Col (18)
19. help me feel better about myself. . .	☐	☐	Col (19)
20. let students fool around too much instead of getting much done. . . .	☐	☐	Col (20)
21. make my classwork seem important. . .	☐	☐	Col (21)
22. Because of this class, I have been reading more than I usually do. . .	☐	☐	Col (22)
23. If I had my choice, I wouldn't come to this class at all.	☐	☐	Col (23)
		BLANK	Col (24-7

Thank you for your help

Do Not Write This Space	
Column	
(73-74)	
(75)	
(76-79)	
(80)	

082677