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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

In an attempt to increase the understanding and support of a child's development in preparation for school admission, a project uniting the efforts of home and school was developed. This study focused on the children and their families who participated in a summer intervention project. The purpose of this study was to provide a comprehensive description and documentation of process related to (1) conceptual issues, (2) design issues, (3) implementation issues, and (4) evaluation issues of an early screening and intervention project for prekindergarten children. The study focused on those children, their parents or guardians, and the school personnel who were affected by the interactive roles of those involved in the process.

One hundred forty children who were eligible to enter two suburban Ohio schools in the autumn of 1980 were screened to determine their acquisition of developmental skills. These children, to be eligible for kindergarten admission, had to be legally 5 years of age by September 30, 1980. Forty of the children screened were identified as being the most in need of remediation in preparation for entering kindergarten. Parents or guardians of these children were invited to participate in a summer intervention project, the goal of the project being to help the identified children gain the skills needed for
success in kindergarten. Twenty-four children and their families completed a three phase process of (1) developmental task screening during the spring prior to kindergarten admission, (2) participation in a summer intervention program, and (3) screening of developmental tasks during the autumn kindergarten program.

The General Problem

Psychological research and popular literature have suggested that the amount of time children spend in activities with their parents contributes to the quality of young children's lives in general, and to children's cognitive development and academic achievement in particular (Goldberg, 1977; Bayley and Schafer, 1964; Hess and Shipman, 1965). Throughout the formative years, from birth through age six, a child's first, all encompassing, social milieu is that of the family. Mounting evidence indicates that the impact of family members, especially parents, during the first years of life will ultimately be greater than that of years spent in school (Bronfenbrenner, 1975). The family determines to a very large extent the degree to which schooling will be effective (Goodrich, 1975).

Developmental theorists have provided extensive evidence as to the importance of the child's early environment, specifically the "crucial" first five years of development (Hunt, 1961; Bruner, 1966; and Bloom, 1964).

The interest and concern of parents for their children without regard to socio-economic status are often underestimated (Boek, 1969). Virtually all parents are interested in what is best for their
children and in upgrading their lives in general. Parents need to be aware that they are the most important persons in the lives of their children (Bronfenbrenner, 1975).

A parent, regardless of his own achievement in life, desires for his child the right to reach the full limits of his capability. Most parents are eager to help their child settle into school. Many parents find it difficult, however, to make the initial approach to the teacher to find out how they might contribute (Rowe, 1977). Parents and teachers alike want children to succeed in school. Since parents exist on the periphery of the educational hierarchy, educators must initiate measures designed to forge a home/school liaison (Thomas, 1980). Professional educators, assumably, have the knowledge and skills to invite and include parents in the education of their children.

An intervention program which is based on a thorough knowledge of the individual child's developmental skills and progress can be the beginning of an on-going educational process uniting home and school, parent and teacher as conjoint educators of the child. The time spent with a child in developing cognitive skills may also reflect attitudinal changes on the part of the parent which will impact the child's future learning. According to Goldberg (1977) maternal time allocation reflects a mother's attitudes toward learning. Children who have been given time for learning in the home will function better at school and will be prepared to take advantage of the learning environment the school provides. Maternal time allocation not only serves to influence a child's cognitive abilities per se but is reflected in
attitudes toward a learning environment. Hess and Shipman (1965) agreed that parents transmit attitudes about learning to their children through specific interactions with them and these generalize to and affect children's responses to learning situations. If an intervention program serves as a positive experience for both the parent and the child, the impact on attitudinal change may have a greater effect on future learning than that of specific cognitive skills learned.

The quality of direct contact time, which includes the parent's attitude toward learning, may be of prime importance in effecting the learning of cognitive tasks (Goldberg, 1977). The work of Bronfenbrenner (1975) is highly supportive of the level of gain made by children when parents are included in the learning experience. Bronfenbrenner sees socioeconomic status as contributing heavily to the longitudinal effects of prekindergarten programs. Boek (1969) describes an intervention program designed to prepare environmentally disadvantaged children in rural areas for better success in school. She describes how staff are received more readily into homes by both the child and the parent when instructional materials or "toys and games" are presented as a part of the visit. She relates that staff members initially underestimated the interest and concern of parents for their children but later found parents truly interested in what was best for their children and in upgrading their lives. Mothers were also said to become more aware that they were the most important person in the lives of their children.
The school system needs to be sensitive to the fears of parents as they expose their own academic "frailities" in helping their children learn. Some parents have unpleasant memories of their own school years and are unnerved by the prospect of talking face to face with a teacher about their children, but they are no less interested than other parents in their children's success (Canady and Seyfarth, 1979). The school system in general and teachers specifically need to be aware not only of a child's level of readiness or skill development but also of the subjective aspects of the home environment and parental attitudes.

In an attempt to tie these global concerns into a specific plan for action, this researcher provides a comprehensive description and documentation of process related to (1) conceptual issues, (2) design issues, (3) implementation issues, and (4) evaluation issues of an early screening and intervention project for prekindergarten children. The study will focus on those children, their parents or guardians, and the school personnel who were affected by the interactive roles of those involved in the process.

**Procedures**

**Perception of a Need**

This study began with the description and documentation of the evolving conceptual issues which were examined through a series of meetings held within the school district. Interested district personnel, kindergarten teachers, aides, and parents began to examine a concern—the wide range of developmental skills with which children enter the kindergarten setting. One impetus for these meetings originated
from the concern expressed by kindergarten teachers, aides, district
cordinators, principals and parents that the initial communication
between the school system and the home be a positive contact which
would facilitate future positive patterns of communication.

Kindergarten teachers and their aides had shared their concern
that entering kindergarten children show a large variation of learning
skills. They questioned if there were a way of identifying and
combating such a large range of learning prior to the first day of
school. Parents expressed a desire to know how they might prepare
children for kindergarten entrance and asked for school support in
this task. Head Start and private preschool personnel had expressed a
concern that parents continue to feel welcomed as a part of the public
school classroom. Principals had asked for suggestions as to
screening instruments and techniques for early identification of
learning needs within the individual child. School personnel had
expressed a desire for a better or more accurate "perception" of the
child, family and community which they were serving. Representatives
of the school system, parents, community persons, as well as Teacher
Corps personnel from the university perceived a need for early com­
munication between home and school to facilitate the positive entrance
of the child into the school system. The Teacher Corps is a federally
funded program which exists in recognition of the continuing need to
strengthen the educational opportunities available to children in
areas having concentrations of low income families. At its initiation
in 1965, Teacher Corps was to create a corps of teachers prepared to
teach low income children and to define teacher preparation programs
which would train such teachers effectively. Teacher Corps today aims, more than ever, at the roots of the public school system. The results of these mutual concerns served as the impetus for the design, implementation and analysis of a short term intervention project involving parents in preparing their children for kindergarten.

Program Design

The program which resulted from the mutual sharing of concerns was a process of identifying individual children's skill development progress prior to school admission and using parents as the prime educator of the child to develop the child's skill level. School district personnel representing two elementary schools in this suburban Ohio district committed themselves to the cooperative development of an intervention program based on the information gained through the screening process. The conceptualization stage began with a series of monthly meetings during the winter of 1979. Represented at these meetings were education coordinators, four kindergarten teachers, two teacher aides, three parents, two community representatives, and the Title I director for the district. Title I, Department of Education, provides special educational support services to low income families. The community representatives were a teacher from the YMCA preschool program and the local Head Start education coordinator. Head Start is a federally funded program under the Administration for children, Youth and Families which provides education programs for preschool age children from low income families. The Teacher Corps project director assumed the major responsibility
for managing the meetings, along with the district coordinator and this researcher. The Teacher Corps director and this researcher prepared the agenda, conducted the meetings, and made follow-up contacts. There was a desire on the part of these participants to assist the child and the family in making a comfortable transition into the school system. Development of the project proceeded through the following steps:

1. Selection of a developmental screening instrument.
2. Spring screening of children registering to enter kindergarten in the Autumn of 1980.
4. Making and assembling learning task games based on the developmental tasks in the screening inventory.
5. Training of university students preparing to enter the field of education to administer the screening instrument.
6. Selection of children and their families for participation in the summer intervention program. Selection based on results of the spring screening.
7. Kindergarten teachers and this researcher to meet with parents of children scoring in lower one-third on the spring screening. Parents given initial learning barrel of tasks based on their child's area of identified task weakness.
(8) Teacher Corps interns (persons with previous experience in education, who have been trained to teach in low-income communities by the Teacher Corps, a federally funded project designed to improve education for children of low-income families) summer follow-up visits to homes of participating families to pick-up first barrel and to explain and distribute another barrel or barrels. Hopefully each family would have three barrels placed in their home over the ten week period during the summer of 1980.

(9) Autumn screening using the Santa Clara Inventory with administration by a new group of university students preparing to enter the education field. Students again to be trained by this researcher.

(10) Follow-up conference interviews to gain information on how the program met the initial stated needs of children, parents, teachers and aides, and the district. Interviews to be held with all adult participants who would be affected by the interactive roles of those involved in the process.

Program Implementation

The Santa Clara Inventory of Developmental Tasks was the instrument selected by school, university, and community persons for the spring and autumn screening of children entering the two elementary schools at the kindergarten level in the autumn of 1980. As the researcher on the project, I reviewed prekindergarten screening
Instruments and presented information on two instruments, the Denver Developmental Inventory and the Santa Clara Inventory of Developmental Tasks. The Santa Clara was my preference, as it was not only simple to administer and understand, but the Santa Clara Plus contained task cards or recipes of activities directly related to the next task needing development. Each child could easily be "tracked" by parent and teacher. The next step in development was charted or profiled and a learning game or task was suggested in the "recipe cards" for teaching a new skill. The district personnel also preferred the Santa Clara Inventory as the materials had previously been purchased by the district and were presently not in use. This program would help justify that initial purchase as well as support the district's original choice of this instrument.

Undergraduate students registered at the university in a kindergarten method course were given the option of participating in a twenty hour field experience in administering the Santa Clara Inventory to the one hundred forty children registering to enter the two elementary schools. Twenty-four students selecting this course option were given instructions and supervised by this researcher in the use of the inventory. Two groups of twelve students participated — one group in the spring screening and a second group during the autumn screening.

The kindergarten teachers and aides at the two elementary schools reviewed the tasks on the inventory and designed a "get-acquainted" handbook to be distributed to the parents of prekindergarten children during the spring registration and screening.
The teachers and aides also participated in two all day workshops to make "learning task barrels" for distribution to the families. Forty of the one hundred forty children in the spring screening were invited to participate in the use of the barrels in their homes over a ten week period during the summer. This was the intervention process. Twenty-nine of the forty families who began the intervention phase of the project had children who were again screened in the autumn of 1980. The task abilities as documented on each child during the spring and autumn screenings were shared with the parents or guardians of each child during the autumn conference interviews.

Follow-up conference interviews were held with twenty-eight of the twenty-nine families completing the project. All attempts failed to contact one family. The conference interviews served as a time not only to give detailed information on each child but to gain parental in-put on how the project was perceived. These interviews served as substantial documentation of the impact of the screening and intervention process. District and university persons connected with the project were also interviewed to investigate the key factors influencing the impact of the project as well as to address areas needing change or modification.

Program Explanation

Explanations of the changes which were the result of the intervention project are documented through two sources: 1) the Santa Clara Inventory spring and autumn screening profiles on each child participating in the intervention project and 2) interviews by this researcher with the parents of the children, kindergarten teachers
and aides, district personnel, student assessors, and Teacher Corps personnel. The heightened awareness of parents and teachers in terms of understanding and supporting children developmentally is documented and described through the interviewing process. The impact of the program can best be analyzed and evaluated in terms of participant observation and sharing.

Recommendations for change in making this short term intervention project into an on-going intervention program are made by this researcher. The recommendations of participants through the interviewing process will be related to communication for change within the school district. The documentation of this screening and intervention project can serve as the foundation for the development of a long range prekindergarten parent involvement program.

The comprehensive description and documentation of process will proceed as follows based on the Problem Overview given in Chapter I: Chapter II will give a comprehensive Review of the Literature; Chapter III will present the Program Development and Implementation which will be concerned with issues of design and implementation; Chapter IV will be the Data On the Screening Process and Prescribed Learning Materials; Chapter V will be the Data and Analysis of the Process Based on the Participant Interviews; Chapter VI will summarize the description and documentation process by giving an Evaluation and Recommendations based on this researcher's perception of the organization and communication process.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This chapter reviews the literature examining the effective components of intervention in an attempt to unite the efforts of home and school. It also attempts to synthesize the major components supporting a parent involvement kindergarten readiness project for changing attitudes and communication.

The literature reviewed gives a foundation for the comprehensive description and documentation process which follows in Chapters III, IV and V. The process of early screening and intervention for prekindergarten children and the interaction process between parents and school personnel as a part of that process is reviewed in terms of (1) conceptual issues, (2) design issues, (3) implementation issues and (4) evaluation issues.

The importance of the "family component" in effecting the learning process of the child will be stressed throughout the documentation. In discussing the relationship between families and schools, Sara Lightfoot (1981) terms the family as "the primary environment". She contends that families continue to perform the most complex, subtle, and difficult social task--socialization. All families do the job of socialization, despite the ways in which they may be perceived and judged by researchers, policy makers, and social service givers.
Lightfoot (1981) states:

The sad irony is that education for the majority of children will only be successful when there is trust, accountability, and responsibility shared between families, communities, and schools. Being aware of the power and significance of families does not mean that schools should not be held accountable for teaching children. Rather the opposite—once school personnel begin to value the significant place of families in the educational process, they will feel more responsible to the communities they serve and to the children they teach. Once teachers become more cognizant of the forms and styles of learning within families, education may be seen more holistically and the medium and message of school can be designed to be adaptive to the values and ideals of community life. (p. 100)

Conceptual Issues

Perceptions of the Child

Perceptions of the child, of the role of the school, of the role of the parent, and of the need for communication, of both attitudes and of academic expectations, vary with the "eye of the beholder". A teacher, facing a new group of school beginners for the first time, is aware of tremendous individual differences. No matter how well trained and experienced the teacher is, according to Rowe (1977), until sufficient knowledge of the personal developmental characteristics of each one of the children in the group is known, the teacher is only partly prepared for the task ahead. Parents also perceive themselves as eager to help their child settle into school. However, many parents find it difficult to make the initial approach to the teacher to find out how they might contribute.

Both family and school share the primary concern that the child succeed in school. Unfortunately, a lack of communication and support between these two major institutions of socialization can adversely affect the growth and development of the child. Perhaps
this problem, which appears to be one of communication, goes even deeper and begins with differences in perception. Becker (1953, p. 129) suggested that teachers are inclined to see parents as "an unpredictable and uncontrollable element", as a force that endangers and may even destroy the existing authority system over which the teacher has some measure of control. This supports the statement by Thomas (1980, p. 203) that "teachers tend to hold parents at bay through aloofness, rigid bureaucratic practices, and claims of territorial rights and professionalism." He feels that this schism between parents and schools will not be resolved until educators accept the idea that most parents desire the best for their children (even though they may lack the wherewithal to obtain it). Since parents exist on the periphery of the educational hierarchy, it is up to the educators themselves to initiate measures designed to forge a home/school liaison. Thomas mentions that the evidence is substantial that when parents and other community members are intimately involved in the day-to-day learning of their children, schools do better at managing disciplinary problems. They also do better at educating pupils and maintaining parental and community support.

McPherson (1972) argues that the differences between teachers and parents arise from fundamentally different ways of viewing the child. She feels that "to wish a child well" does not mean the same thing to parents and teachers. Parents view the child in terms of long range plans and goals. Teachers are concerned with specific developmental and skill gain in the here and now.
The Child in Two Worlds

Children have to adapt to two worlds—the world of home and the world of school. The values, standards and even language may be different in these two worlds, and the school child quickly discovers that somehow he is expected to fit into both. The result is that the school child may never feel completely at home in either world (Somerset, 1976). In the desire to please both parents and teachers he may have to reject one world. The child shows a different face to each. Both parent and teacher need an awareness of the other's world.

Parental Role Models

Goldberg (1977) investigated (1) the amount of time mothers spend with preschoolers in specific activities related to cognitive development and the level of intensity of contact shared between mother and child during these activities; (2) socio-demographic variables which influence mother's time spent with children; and (3) relations between mother's time spent with children and multiple measures of cognitive development and school readiness skills in children measured independently. Information on the time and nature of the mother's interaction with children was put on a daily diary instrument and recorded through an interviewing schedule. It was found that these "middle-class mothers" spent three times as many hours in social activities with their children than was spent in specific educational activities. Goldberg's work suggests that maternal time reflects the mother's attitude toward learning. This contact time with the mother heavily influences the child's appreciation for learning and is a positive influence in preparing the child to
function in a school environment. The impact modeled by the parent's attitude may have a greater influence on the child's learning than the modeling of cognitive tasks per se.

Hess and Shipman (1965) argue that parents transmit attitudes about learning to their children through specific interactions. These transmitted attitudes tend to generalize and affect children's responses to learning situations. Until recently, the home environment has most often been assessed in global measures, including social class (Hess, 1970), status of the mother (Hoffman, 1974) and child-rearing attitudes of parents (Bayley and Schafer, 1964). Psychological research and current popular writings have suggested that the amount of time children spend in activities with their parents contributes importantly to the quality of young children's lives in general and to children's cognitive development and academic achievement in particular.

The presence or absence of the father in the home, or what Elkind and Weiner (1978) prefer to call inadequate fathering, likewise has implications for how well a child's intellectual capacity develops. According to these authors, a father's absence has a greater impact on the preschooler than on the older child. Biller (1978), who is accumulating data to show that children profit from close relationships with fathers very early in their lives, claims that we have to educate men to realize the important impact they have on their children.

White (1977) states that the three main obstacles parents face in trying to do their best for children are ignorance, stress, and
lack of assistance. He insists that parenting must be taught. Parents are the child's first, and should be his best, teachers. They are a powerful and potent force in a child's development—mental, physical, social, and emotional. It is now clear that there are no practical alternatives to involving parents in providing the kinds of home life and stimulating experiences that encourage a child's mind to grow. Furthermore, since positive early experiences are more desirable, more effective, more humane, and more economical than remediation procedures, educators have little choice but to advocate and to establish working relationships with parents. Educators and government must find the ways and means to ally themselves with parents in such a manner that all will want to, and know how to, provide the concerned attention and loving responsiveness which the educational development of their children demands.

**Parents as Educators**

The Plowden Report (1967) identified significant factors affecting (1) parental attitudes toward learning and education and (2) specific parental interest in the child's school and progress. These factors were even more important than socioeconomic status in predicting a child's response to education and progress, and they were much more important than school buildings and specific programs at school.

Parents have a strong desire for their children to achieve in school. Parents hope that their children will exceed them in achievement. Yet, according to Morgan (1979), a substantial proportion of parents do not clearly perceive the educational importance of early
stimulation and play. A substantial proportion do not offer their children an organized preschool experience, the storytelling and consistent reading experiences, and the access to cultural and educative as well as recreational experiences which are likely to help the child lay a good foundation for early development and effective response to school. The contrast between ambition and hope and what appears to be actual practice is a rather sad one.

According to Bronfenbrenner (1974), if the gains of an early childhood educational program are to be successful initially and sustained over a period of time, parents must be directly involved in the language and cognitive development of their children. When parents are involved as participants, the child maintains his gain and continues to benefit long after the early education program. In addition, there is a "percolator" effect, as the parent practices learned skills on other children in the family, both younger and older.

Bronfenbrenner (1974) concludes: (a) gains made by children in home-based programs hold up for three to four years after the program terminates (presumably because the parent is around long after the project); (b) the most critical element in early education programs is the direct involvement of a mother or a mother figure in the developmental activities of the child; (c) the earlier the involvement of interested parents and their children, the more effective the program is for the children; and (d) children continue to benefit from parent involvement through grade six.
Szczepanski (1977) discusses the early socialization of children and the importance of learning experiences that take place in the family. She feels that the child's manner of skill acquisition, as well as acquisition of knowledge, values and attitudinal patterns, is acquired from the family before entering kindergarten. Because of this she feels that kindergarten educators should be aware of family socialization processes.

She believes that family education, which forms the basis for both kindergarten and school education, should to a certain extent be geared to what happens in the kindergarten. Educational concepts of the kindergarten should, therefore, be explained to parents. That is, either kindergarten educators ought to somehow continue the family education, or parents ought to get their child ready for the kindergarten educational process. Otherwise, the passage from the family to the kindergarten can become a serious crisis in the child's life. This conflict is unavoidable when methods applied in the two institutions differ strikingly.

Bausell (1979) argues that the best way to improve student achievement is to increase parental teaching of children prior to school entry. The explanation for social class differences in achievement is that the experiences of children from higher socioeconomic status homes are far more like the educational experiences in the school than those of children from lower socioeconomic backgrounds. The essential role of parents in the education of their children must be recognized and steps must be taken to encourage parental teaching at all socioeconomic levels.
Weibly (1979) cites educational research that suggests that the involvement of low socioeconomic status parents in the educational process has a positive influence on their children's achievement. At the preschool level, programs in which parents were instructed in ways to promote their children's intellectual development were found to be particularly successful. They produced long term improvements in student achievement. In some cases parents working as paraprofessionals in the school or as advisors for preschool programs produced student achievement gains.

Thus far, it seems that programs designed to train low-income parents in tutoring techniques have been the most successful in improving achievement in elementary school students. Changing the parents' attitudes toward the school and their child's academic potential, as well as the parents' own feelings of competence in the role of teacher, may be an important first step to improving student achievement.

In today's cost-effective educational system, a number of forces are combining to call for increased parental involvement. Federal programs and guidelines require participation of parents as a prerequisite for funding, particularly for those programs involving low-income families. Indications are that parental involvement in the educational process has a positive influence on the child's academic achievement.

**Early Intervention Programs**

The early years of life are a period of the most rapid development of intelligence and other crucial characteristics as well
as a time when the environment exerts the greatest influence upon the
development of these characteristics. A thorough analysis of hundreds
of longitudinal studies of human growth conducted by Benjamin Bloom
(1965) at the University of Chicago have revealed two points of
concern:

1. With respect to intelligence as measured at age 17, 50%
is developed between birth and age four and another 30% between ages
four and eight;

2. With respect to academic achievement, one-third of general
achievement patterns that will be attained by age 18 have been
developed prior to the child's entrance into first grade.

The above reference to achievement does not mean that the
young child has been subjected to formal structured scholastic exer-
cizes, but rather that the groundwork for later achievement in school
has been laid. For example, significant people in a child's environ-
ment have stimulated and nourished the young child's curiosity, have
shown a concern for achievement on the part of the child, have pro-
vided a desirable model for language development and for motivation,
and have exposed the child to a variety of experiences and materials.
All of these factors serve to strengthen the child's potential to
achieve in an academic setting.

Design Issues

Parent Participation

More research on methods of improving academic achievement
through parent involvement is still needed, but the research thus far
has generally shown that such programs do have a positive effect on
academic achievement. Educational research suggests that the involvement of parents of low socioeconomic status (SES) children in the educational process has a positive influence on children's academic success (Matuszek, 1977).

At the preschool level, studies in which parents were instructed concerning methods of promoting their children's intellectual development were found to be particularly successful in producing long term improvements in the academic achievement of low SES children. A few studies also report success in improving the achievement of low SES children whose parents worked as paraprofessionals in the school or served in an advisory capacity for preschool programs.

At the elementary level, the limited research which is available indicates that parents who serve as tutors for their children can improve their children's academic achievement. Research has found the following to be related to academic achievement (Ware, 1973; Brophy, Good, and Nedler, 1975):

- the amount of academic guidance and direct instruction provided in the home;
- the cognitive level and style of the parents;
- the amount of reading and educational materials available in the home;
- the frequency of verbal contact between parent and child;
- the attitude of the parents toward the school;
- the parents' willingness to devote time to their child.

Observations that parents differ in their ability to teach children effectively, and the lack of success of intervention programs which do not involve parents, have led to efforts to improve the
academic achievement of low socioeconomic status and ethnic minority children by increasing the parents' involvement in their children's education. Bronfenbrenner (1974), for example, believes that four-to-six-year-olds can benefit from a cognitively oriented organized preschool program, but it should be accompanied by a strong parent involvement component to enhance and sustain its effects (also see Brophy, et al., 1975).

Changing parents' attitudes toward the school and toward their child's academic potential, and by strengthening their own feelings of competence in the role of teacher can be taken as an important first step toward improving low SES student achievement. It is also important to realize that parents with low SES backgrounds are willing, in the majority of cases, to become involved in their child's education, if approached in the proper manner. Future research must focus on finding the most effective methods of employing parent involvement to improve the achievement of low SES and ethnic minority children.

Changing Attitudes

Hess (1976) summarizes the evaluation of 28 preschool programs. The programs assessed showed a positive change in parental attitudes. The two attitudes for which significant changes were most often found were, first, a greater sense of personal control over one's own life, and second, more flexible attitudes toward the child and his development. The parents' pattern of interaction with the child changed. Verbal behavior of parents tended to include more support for the child's efforts and to show a more varied and
syntactically complex language pattern. Studies of nonverbal behavior found a greater responsiveness on the part of the mothers and more active participation in interactions with the child. Studies of the home environment show that siblings of children in the program seem to have benefited from the training through a diffusion of effects. The home environments were more likely to include specific resources that are usually correlated with achievement in school.

Parent training programs do appear to affect the behavior of parents and the resources of the home. The more a program concentrates on parents, the more likely it is to produce significant and stable I.Q. gains for children. Greater effects in immediate and follow-up testing are produced by a one-to-one teacher/parent relationship than when parents are taught as a group. Home visits are especially effective (Hess, 1976). Also noted in the evaluation of programs was that the degree of structure in the activities used by parents was positively related to greater program effectiveness. No relationship was found between the content of the curriculum used by parents (focus on verbal interaction, focus upon sensori-motor development, focus on general cognitive activities) and magnitude of impact on children.

Boek, (1969), in evaluating a preschool program, expresses some practical concerns of working on an intervention program designed to prepare young culturally disadvantaged children in a rural area for better success in school. Problems such as finding no one at home even after a time had been agreed upon by a mother, grandmother, or other family member are a common occurrence. Staff, in order to
enhance their entry and acceptance into a home, found it beneficial to carry with them toys (and instructional materials) as presents for the children.

Some practical indicators in the environment of readiness for learning were: 1) the father's employment, 2) the father and mother's schooling, and 3) the size of the family. The presence of a telephone in the household was also indicative of learning readiness (Boek, 1969).

Project Follow-Through, which was an extension of the Head Start and Home Start concept into the primary years of the public school system, was impacted directly by the Child and Family Resource Program (CFRP). Dr. Edward Zigler, former Director of the Office of Child Development, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, was the originator of CFRP. This was a significant effort on the part of the Office of Child Development to integrate a wide variety of services into a family. It was found that child development programs attract persons interested not only in child development but also in family and community development. The CFRP begins with the assessment process, since not all families have the same needs, and needs may be met in different ways. Home Visitors initiate the assessment process and assist with service coordination. CFRP staff members recognized that the home environment, as defined and provided by parents, had the greatest impact on the child, and child development centers should therefore attempt to supplement and assist the parent. The program hoped that the support services provided would not only benefit the child, but would build on existing strengths and goals of the family.
and thus foster the development of the family as a unit. The constant challenge to CFRP staff is to maintain a continuous, up-to-date evaluation of each family's needs and progress in relation to its previously identified goals, so that the changing basic needs of each family continue to be met, while at the same time the independence and self sufficiency of the family are encouraged (CFRP, 1975).

Influence of Parental Values

In general, the research literature seems to suggest that in seriously disadvantaged families there is a pattern of disorganization, inconsistency, low levels of expectations, and a disciplinary pattern which utilizes force either verbally or physically. Wolf (1964) found that the best predictors of academic success were:

1. parental expectation for intellectual achievement,
2. the amount of information the mother had on the child's intellectual development,
3. opportunities provided for enlarging the child's vocabulary,
4. the extent to which parents created situations for learning in the home, and
5. the extent of assistance in learning situations related to scholastic and non-school activities.

Bloom (1964) suggested that differences in academic performance may be related to the value placed on school learning by parents and students and the reinforcement of school learning by the home. Students in advantaged homes may be able to see economic returns from education, whereas students in a deprived environment may have difficulty seeing a relationship between school and job. In addition, Bloom indicated that the school environment, particularly the morale and training of the school staff, might account for differences.
In discussing the impact of the home environment on the child's learning Bloom stated:

The effects of the environments, especially of the extreme environments, appear to be greatest in the early and more rapid periods of intelligence development, and least in the later and less rapid periods of development. Although there is relatively little evidence of the effects of changing the environment on the changes in intelligence, the evidence so far available suggests that marked changes in the environment in the early years can produce greater changes in intelligence than will equally marked changes in the environment at later periods of development (pp. 88-89).

The social development of the child is a result of a mix of cognitive and affective conditions; the intellectual development of the child is also a product of a mix of conditions. The effective family—that is the family that promotes the intellectual, social, and personal development of the child—provides a setting in which there is a mixture of a warm, positive emotional climate combined with an atmosphere of teaching and expectation in the intellectual domain. Perhaps Caldwell's (1967) statement can serve here as a summary:

One might infer that the optimal learning environment for the young child is that which exists when (a) a young child is cared for in his own home (b) in the context of a warm and nurturant emotional relationship (c) with his mother (or a reasonable facsimile thereof) under conditions of (d) varied sensory and cognitive input. (p. 19)

Several educators have taken the position that the school system must take the initiative in the creation of compensatory education and parental involvement. For example, the position has been taken that the home should be the place for compensatory education, but if it cannot be done there, then the school must do it (Bloom, Davis, and Hess, 1965). Fusco (1966) claims that:
Generally socially disadvantaged parents are interested in their children's education and are eager for them to succeed in school; their seeming indifference and apathy reflect their lack of knowledge regarding the nature of the demands the school will place on their children, and their lack of skills concerning ways in which they can prepare their children for the transition from home to school, and reinforce the support school efforts made on behalf of their children. (p. 159)

Fusco therefore concludes that the school must take the initiative.

We find that disadvantaged parents often view the school with skepticism and pessimism and are not interested in the imposition of school values and attitudes upon their way of life. There are differences in values and patterns of living between the middle class school teacher and the lower class family that must be bridged. In addition, we have seen that these parents are often pictured as feeling powerless to effect change in their own circumstances, so that although the school may have to take the initiative, how and why the school does it will affect its success.

Educators often feel that the disadvantaged parent is incapable of working with his child in a way that will enhance the child's development. But as Liddle and Rockwell (1966) point out:

Adults do not have to be well educated to be intellectually stimulating to young children...The parents of disadvantaged can learn to play the important functions of showing, telling, and listening to their children. (p. 399)

Elaborating upon this premise, the authors identify two types of home visits—the old type, in which teachers study the home so that they can take into account home factors in classroom learning, and a new type, in which teachers leave learning-related materials in the home. Liddle and Rockwell suggest that each school support a home-school liaison person to give parents specific suggestions and to urge them
to ask questions of the child about school. Such a program reflects the desire of educators to have the parent accept the school model as correct and learn to implement it at home. This type of program assumes that the school is correct. However, other modes of parental involvement require changing the school rather than changing the family.

A basic dilemma that must be faced is the question of control. Gordon (1970) believes that educators see curriculum, teaching methods, and school organization as their professional realm, and that parents and those outside the education profession feel that they have much to say and to contribute and should, therefore, be involved in decision making. Both the so-called disadvantaged home and the school must somehow be changed through the combined efforts of school personnel and parents. Many involvement programs seek to change the home and leave the school inviolate. Many parents are now demanding that the school change to become more what parents want. Institutions have long had a history of spending their energies in preserving the status quo. Sometimes this has led to the destruction of the institution as the only means available for change. It would be indeed unfortunate if this were our only solution. If we do not wish the home or the school destroyed, we must somehow find vehicles for communication and cooperation by which both institutions are modified without going through the destructive phase.

Parental involvement means involvement of parents in partnership with the teacher. The needs, strengths, concerns, and special knowledge of the parent must be meshed with the expertise of the
professional. This requires an atmosphere of mutual trust. But how is such trust to be established? Perhaps the groundwork exists in the present community-school contact or resource person. This is often in the role of education coordinator or parent educator. Trust can develop from their effective work, but it also requires that teachers and principals and supervisors become clearer in defining what they feel is open for discussion and what is not. Institutional change is neither easy nor painless, yet it is essential for progress.

Different communities and school systems will obviously arrive at different solutions to the problem, but all need to face the issue that parents do not perceive themselves (or will not continue to perceive themselves) as recipients and clients. This does not mean that parents wish to intrude on the professional. What they seek, according to Gordon (1970), is not control but participation!

Parent/Teacher Communication

According to Canady and Seyfarth (1979) many parents and teachers are strangers. They give the example of a parent remarking that, "It is by sheer faith that I send my child to school, because I don't know anyone there" (Canady and Seyfarth, 1979, p. 7). Today the formal conference has replaced informal contacts as a means of exchanging information between parents and teachers. Teachers have mixed feelings about parents. Canady and Seyfarth assert that, "Teachers resent parents who intrude on their authority or question their competence" (1979, p. 7).

One of the greatest barriers noted by Canady and Seyfarth in parent/teacher communication is the unpleasant memories that some
parents have of their own school years. Such parents are unnerved by the prospect of talking face-to-face with a teacher about their children. But such parents are no less interested than other parents in their children's success, and careful, patient effort with them will pay off. The teacher needs to project an image of helper rather than that of critic or judge.

However, few teachers receive formal training in working with parents. And yet, from the time the child starts kindergarten, close co-operation between kindergarten and home is necessary. Pause (1977) feels that parents should be regularly informed about their children's development and provided information so that they can understand and support the work of the kindergarten. She stresses that difficulties which arise should be discussed with a child's parents. Parent/teacher co-operation is meant to prevent conflicts between home, kindergarten, and school from being carried out on the backs of the children. Early communication can prevent "disturbances, which manifest themselves in regression and aggression and thus hinder useful cooperation" (p. 28).

Marian Beebe (1976) supports the visitation of teachers into children's homes as one means of opening communication between parent and teacher. She observes that parents tend to assess their child's development in a broad range of readiness skills. This interest by the parent in the child's readiness can serve as a motivator for at home teaching in areas where the child may need special help. Teachers, in turn, can benefit from seeing the children in their
homes. Beebe (1976) expresses how home visits can help a teacher in appreciating the child's environment:

It really helps me understand the children, and their parents, too, in a way that seeing them only in a classroom setting would not provide. When I see a child living in a house without a single magazine or a newspaper or a child who is overindulged by a too accommodating mother or who is being severely scolded by a too strict or demanding parent, I get an insight into this child that I simply could not get any other way. This makes a lot of difference in the way I deal with the child and the parent. (p. 79)

Early intervention allows the school and family to combine forces early in the life of the child and together to set common goals and objectives that will help maximize potentials.

**Developmental Assessment**

There is a need to be more concerned with the process of developmental screening. It should be more than an assessment of cognitive skills. According to Garber (1979), the school psychologist should include in the evaluation of the child's assessment a statement of the "intactness" of the family and the value of schooling as imparted to the child. The kind of support that can be expected from a child's home as he moves through the school system is of major importance. The school must understand the individual child and provide appropriate help, but in cooperation with the family. It must ensure that the school is extended into the home. Bridging the gap for those children requires a partnership between home and school.

In discussing the partnership between home and school, Darnell (1976) states:

If parents are to become partners with the teachers in being responsible for the child's learning progress, then both should have a common base of operation and a joint understanding of what the other is expecting of the child. (p. 7)
She further suggests that one method of assessing a child's present functioning is to compare the child's competence and skills to some developmental continuum, set of expectations, or performance objectives on which the child will be evaluated. Developmental assessment can eliminate the more subjective judgmental terms and focus more on behavior descriptions that are developmental in sequence.

**Implementation Issues**

**Linking Assessment to Intervention**

The process of assessment and intervention is both complex and highly interrelated and, therefore, demands the formulation of systematic procedures to ensure the flow and linkage from diagnosis to educational programming. Early Childhood Specialists, teachers, and parents must integrate efforts in a systematic way to construct meaningful assessment/curriculum linkages for each child in order to:

1. Describe a child's current level of functioning;
2. Specify short and long term educational goals and objectives;
3. Select appropriate evaluative procedures to monitor both child progress and proper effectiveness.

It may be safely stated that screening is without purpose unless it serves as a starting point—a "blueprint" for appropriate placement and individualized programming. Ysseldyke and Bagnato (1976) state: "Assessment does not exist in a vacuum, as a separate and distinct practice; it is an integral part of the total educational process" (p. 284). The diagnostic process proceeds from the general to the specific and ensures follow-through from screening to individual programming. Criterion-based developmental diagnosis facilitates the creation of an individualized set of sequenced instructional
targets appropriate to the child's functional level and adapted to his handicaps.

In order to integrate the assessment/intervention process, the five major objectives suggested by Bagnato (1978) should be considered. They are: (1) imbedding assessment within instructional planning; (2) ensuring similarity between behaviors assessed and behaviors taught; (3) providing functional analyses of each child's range of developmental capabilities; (4) facilitating both formative and summative evaluation of developmental progress. Through this process the flow of events from screening through programming is ensured, and a programmatic linkage is forged between developmental assessment and educational programming. This format enables the establishment of behavioral and developmental criteria upon which teaching lessons and progress evaluations can be mutually based.

Compensatory Programs

The national interest in the prevention of educational failure has influenced the growth of programs such as Head Start, Home Start, (an outgrowth of Head Start providing in-home educational experience), and Title I. All of these stress parent education and parent involvement. The Report of the National Conference on Parent and Early Childhood Education (1975) in Denver stated that our society needs and demands more parent and early childhood education programs because of the "nineteen million children living below the poverty line, four million children living in single parent families, and the three million children emotionally disturbed enough to need professional help" (p. 21).
Educators have come to believe that programs fostering a positive attitude toward the schools are essential. Parents' appropriate and positive attitudes and interactions with children are educationally significant. The earlier these programs are started, giving parents supportive resources and information on child development, the better for the parent, the child, and the school.

Although controversy continues regarding the value of intervention in remediating negative environmental effects, there is widespread agreement that intervention programs have yielded considerable information. Such programs give an indication of the impact of environmental interaction on the young learner. Waller and Waller (1980) suggest the following points for consideration in implementing new intervention programs:

1. the importance of the role of the parents in intervention efforts and the corresponding need to discover more about the processes of parent-child interaction and methods of including parents in intervention (e.g. Clarke-Stewart, 1979; Gray and Klaus, 1970; Karnes and Zehrbach, 1977; Stedman, 1977);

2. the significance of continuity between preschool and primary experiences and the corresponding need to consider transitions between home and school at all levels of schooling (e.g. Bentley, Washington and Young, 1974; Ryan, 1975);

3. the importance of individualizing intervention efforts by tailoring curricula to meet the needs of particular children and the corresponding need to investigate the effects of alternative instructional models on individuals and groups of children (e.g., Stedman, 1977; Stodolsky, 1972; Winberg, 1979);

4. the importance of studying intervention with a variety of groups of children in a mixture of settings and the corresponding need to explore the effects of community and cultural group on the transportability of programs. (e.g. Day, 1977; Nichols, 1979; Stedman, 1977)

In common with most of the early childhood intervention programs instituted in the 1960's, the research analyzed by Waller and
Waller has its roots in the work of Hunt (1961), Bloom (1964), and Deutsch (1964). These and others highlighted the crucial effects of the environment on children's cognitive abilities during the first five years of life and the increased likelihood of effecting a positive change in those abilities during that period. One of the results of that work has been an increased recognition of the importance of the parent in providing the environment as a potent influence on the development of the child. First, it was felt that the movement from home to school should be one which considered and built upon the values and strengths of the home environment while simultaneously permitting school related activities in the home. Second, since target families were frequently those who viewed the school as aversive and/or were not comfortable in visiting the school or interacting with school personnel, it was felt that an active process of introducing the parents to school facilities and staff was a necessary adjunct to any intervention program.

Gordon (1970) quotes from a piece of 1891 literature which shows (in language far more flowery than we use today) that the importance of "bonding" home and school is far from a new concept:

We must labor as earnestly in the home as in the kindergarten. The former is the starting point of all civilization, and in endeavor to strengthen and purify, if possible, the home. To do this, regular and systematic home visiting must be done by persons who are especially prepared for the work. The visitor should be competent to give the right counsel and to win the confidence and respect of the parents.

To more closely connect the kindergarten and the home interest, mothers' meetings should be inaugurated, the object of these gathering being to give talks on the care of children, household duties, and the responsibility of motherhood.
The uplifting of the home, however, cannot be theoretical work alone, and for this reason schools for practical housework and with lessons in house economy and thrift must be established. (p. 2)

Today we continue to be concerned with the family unit as a setting in which personality and motivation for learning and development of achievement behaviors are initiated. If compensatory education has as one of its goals the upgrading of the performance of youngsters so that they can achieve well in the school as it is presently constructed, then the research clearly indicates that initial experiences and events in the family play significant roles in achievement motivation and actual achievement (Gordon, 1970).

Research aimed at the questions surrounding compensatory programs seems to be of two types: (1) studies attempting to identify characteristics of young children which predict school success or failure, and (2) studies attempting to evaluate the effects of intervention programs. Unfortunately, the areas of prediction and intervention have developed independently, without the coordination which could be mutually beneficial. Intervention programs (Karnes, 1973) have been developed from a more or less intuitive notion of what will predict school failure, rather than on an empirical basis.

Moore (1981) expresses her concern with the persistent neglect of social outcomes in Head Start evaluation research. This is unfortunate when one considers that the major long term benefits of Head Start may well be reflected in measures other than I.Q. (Zimiles, 1979; Zigler and Trickett, 1978). Evaluation of academic or skill gains in Head Start over the years show children in Head Start have short term gains when compared with other children of similar
backgrounds not in an intervention program. The academic gains which are evident one, two, or three years after intervention gradually fade by second or third grade. Although there are some exceptions to this pattern, it is characteristic of the vast majority of evaluations of intervention programs for high risk children (Horowitz and Pades, 1973; Moore, 1979). More recently, however, long term follow-up studies are providing evidence to suggest that children from Head Start and similar programs are managing to cope with the daily demands of the classroom significantly better than non-program children. There is reason to believe, for example, that program children are less likely to be retained in grade (Abelson, 1974; Lazar and Darlington, 1978) or placed in special education classrooms (Lazar and Darlington, 1978; Weikart, et al. 1978).

Lazar and his colleagues make the point that program children from several different early intervention models were more likely than non-program children to avoid special education placement even after statistically controlling for program effects on I.Q., suggesting that the findings may be due to a general ability to cope with the demands of the school rather than to differences in intellectual ability per se. Weikart et al. (1978) make the following observation about their project:

Firsthand knowledge of the local school system suggests that grade retention and special education placement were importantly, perhaps most importantly, influenced by judgement of children's classroom behavior. The child with whom a teacher could not cope was a most likely candidate for failure in school... (p. 90)

Moore (1981) feels that special education placement and grade retention are two major indicators of school failure. She sees both
of these as traumatic events for the child and the child's family and costly events for society. She states:

If future long term follow-up studies confirm the relation between Head Start enrollment and these indicators of school performance, it will represent a major achievement of early intervention programs. Unfortunately, the factors that account for these results will be unclear inasmuch as program effects on cognitive functioning per se are so limited and elusive. We know virtually nothing about program effects on other aspects of the child's school behavior that could account for the long term benefits of Head Start. Obvious candidates are effects on classroom citizenship, mastery of school protocol, acceptance by teacher, status with peer group leadership. It remains to be seen whether or not early gains in these areas will, in turn, predict adjustment outside of school, including staying out of trouble with the law, establishing one's independence, maintaining one's self on the job market, and ultimately assuming responsibility for a family. (p. 107)

The impact of Head Start and other intervention programs is still being assessed. The accomplishment of the efforts put into such programs may well be in the realm of social competence which leads to openness to learn and achieve academically (Ziegler and Trickett, 1978; Weinberg, 1979).

The Home Start Program which grew out of the Head Start movement was a clearly defined attempt to work with the parent as the prime educator of the child in the home environment. Home Start, a federally funded home-based demonstration program for low-income families with three-to five-year old children, was designed to enhance a mother's skills in dealing with her own children and to provide comprehensive social-emotional, health and nutritional services to the family.

A home-based program provides services in the family home rather than in a classroom setting. A unique feature of Home Start is that it builds upon existing family strengths and assists parents in
their role as the first and most important educators of their own children. The Home Start Guidelines list the following goals (Goodrich, 1975):

- to involve parents directly in the educational development of their children
- to help strengthen in parents their capacity for facilitating the general development of their own children.

The results of the National Home Start Evaluation Interim Report VI show Home Start successful in areas of training parents as educators, the child's cognitive growth, and the expansion of families' use of other social services. Home Start families surpassed control families in six program goal areas (Goodrich, 1975):

- child school readiness
- home materials for the child
- child medical and dental care
- mother/child relationships
- mother as teacher of the child
- family community involvement.

These studies support the conclusion that Home Start children have maintained their advantage over control children in the area of school readiness. In this model mothers gain an awareness and appreciation of "developmental stages" in general, without regard to a particular age level. Thus, as the child enters the public school, she can alter her behavior to provide the needed support for a new stage of child growth.

**Evaluation Issues**

**An Ethnographic/Qualitative Approach**

The epistemological questions raised by qualitative methodology challenge the presuppositions of the natural science approach to scientific investigation. Whereas the latter may assume that the
study of observable deeds and expressed words is adequate to produce knowledge about man and his natural world, qualitative methodologies assume there is value to an analysis of both inner and outer perspectives of human behavior. According to Tikurnoff (1977), an inner perspective or understanding assumes that a complete and ultimately truthful analysis can only be achieved by actively participating in the life of the observed and gaining insights by means of introspection.

In the qualitative mode the emphasis is placed upon the ability of the researcher to assume the role of the other, to grasp the basic underlying assumptions of behavior through understanding the "definition of the situation" from the view of the participants, and upon the need to understand the perceptions and values given to symbols as they are manipulated by man. Qualitative research is based upon the assumption that this method of "inner understanding" produces a comprehension of human behavior in greater depth than is possible from the study of surface behavior, the focus of quantitative methodologies.

Tikurnoff (1977) sees qualitative methodology as referring to those research strategies, such as participant observation, in-depth interviewing, total participation in the activity being investigated, and field work, which allow the researcher to obtain first hand knowledge about the empirical social world in question. Qualitative methodology allows the researcher to "get close to data" thereby developing the analytical, conceptual, and categorical components of explanation from the data itself.
This view of the means by which knowledge and understanding are developed is essentially one of inductive analysis. Theory begins with the extrapolation from the "grounded events" (Tirkunoff, 1977). One begins not with models, hypotheses, or theorems, but rather with the understandings of frequently minute episodes or interactions that are examined for broader patterns and processes. It is from an interpretation of the world through the perspective of the subjects that reality, meanings, and behavior are analyzed. The cannons and precepts of the scientific method are seen to be insufficient; what are needed are intersubjective understandings.

Magoon (1977) finds that the techniques and methods employed by qualitative researchers represent a different orientation from that of quantitative researchers. Quantitative research relies heavily on statistical methods and models. The methodology of qualitative research has a long history in the social sciences; it may collectively be called an "ethnographic approach", an extensive descriptive and interpretative effort at explaining the complexity of phenomena. Sanday (in press, University of Pennsylvania publication) defines ethnography as: "A way of systematically learning reality from the point of view of the participant" (p. 3). The National Institute of Education (NIE, 1974) is encouraging this kind of approach, and many researchers involved in the evaluation of educational programs and in the processes of innovation are finding these approaches useful.

Ethnographic techniques are part of a research tradition that has been developed by anthropologists and community study sociologists. Many social scientists believe that human behavior is
significantly influenced by the settings in which it occurs. They, therefore, believe that it is essential to study psychological events in natural settings, and they claim that settings generate regularities in behavior that often transcend differences among individuals.

The ethnographer seeks to understand the meanings of the participants and hence seeks to be careful not to have his interpretations prematurely overstructured by theory or previous research. Furthermore, he is perhaps more ready than other kinds of researchers to accept the possible uniqueness of the various settings, groups, and organizations that he studies.

When two of the leading scholars of measurement and experimental design, Cronback and Campbell, strongly support qualitative studies, that is strong endorsement indeed for qualitative research, (Schumacher, 1979, p. 18). In a recent unpublished version of his Kurt Lewin Award address, Campbell (1974) modified his views by stating in a few paragraphs that qualitative case studies:

(1) "regularly contradict the prior expectations of the authors, and are convincing and informative to skeptics like me to a degree which my simple-minded rejection does not allow for" (p. 24), (2) "give a probing and lasting power which I had not allowed for" (p. 25), and (3) "validate unanticipated effects missed by more structural approaches' (p. 25). As House (1977) notes, even Cronback has suggested interpreting data in context rather than automatically imposing physical science paradigms to arrive at generalizations.
Smith (1978) notes:

Outside the dominant education psychological paradigm in education research, a larger body of research exists within the qualitative, ethnographic, participant-observation genre. Its roots lie especially in anthropology and several traditions of sociology. A brief overview suggests its applicability to a broad array of problems within education—schools, classrooms, curriculum development, and evaluation. (p. 329)

In ethnographic research there is an open-ended quality to the process. The approach is one of discovery rather than verification. Throughout the data collection process, one is continually searching for meaning. It is a search for broad themes, overall patterns, a way of putting order into the naturalistic phenomena. Simultaneously, the search continues in the literature for concepts and theoretical stances. One is continually reading, observing, and questioning. Often the patterns only become evident months later during data analysis (Schumacher, 1979). The stance is one of seeking a holistic viewpoint and multiple realities in contrast to a reductionist viewpoint which imposes constraints on antecedent conditions and/or outcomes to investigate a limited number of variables. The purpose is one of discovery of phenomena and the interrelations among variables rather than the verification of hypotheses. Field studies tend to demonstrate educational complexities suggesting multiple causal factors and plausible alternative hypotheses.

In describing ethnographic inquiry, Hymes (1979) sees validity as commonly dependent upon accurate knowledge of the meanings of behaviors and institutions to those who participate in them. The validity of knowledge about persons, families, neighborhoods, schools, communities in a country depends upon accurate and adequate knowledge
of the meanings found and imputed to terms, events, persons, and institutions. To an important extent, such meanings cannot be taken for granted as uniform, even within a single city or school district, nor as known in advance. Hymes feels even self-report cannot be relied upon—people are notoriously unable or unwilling to give accurate accounts of the amount of time they spend on various things. Ethnography attempts to make sense out of a family situation, a departmental or district situation, or a community situation with the goal of consciousness raising. Carey (1980) supports this approach to research and proposes that more emphasis be placed on naturalistic inquiry methodologies in our graduate schools of education and in our research and development institutions. Naturalistic inquiry demands that researchers develop a greater appreciation of the subtlety and complexity of the natural world they are trying to explain through educational inquiry.

**Participant Validity**

According to Smith (1980) validity is largely judged according to a principle of relevance or "adequacy" for the participants. Reliability is redefined as a set of propositions which relate to the uniqueness of social settings, to the relativity of individual perspectives, to the reflexivity of knowledge and context, and to the centrality of an active role for the individual in controlling his or her own destiny. Ambiguity and paradox, and contradictions and indeterminacy are seen to be inherent in social life rather than confounding factors which must be "controlled". While "objectivity" on the part of the evaluator is seen as a problematic issue, the issue is
subsumed within a community of assumptions. Hence, observers should report participants' judgments about the program and refrain from explicitly making predigested recommendations (hypotheses). The responsive qualitative evaluators and writers of passionate ethnographies in educational research face the enduring anthropological fieldwork paradox: The more impersonal, objective, and scientific his approach, the greater the likelihood that he will fail to understand his people.... The more sympathetic, empathetic, and intimate he is, however, the greater the likelihood he will lose some or all of his objectivity (Thaiss, 1979).

Rist (1980) finds that within the framework of the history of sciences, if an investigation were undertaken of the present situation, the investigators might well conclude that the rising interest in ethnographic research is a logical conclusion to the current state of affairs in quantitative research. The reaction of increasing numbers of researchers to the limitations of quantitative methods suggests that this method has now approached its outer boundaries. For those who are dissatisfied with the dominant paradigm and who are increasingly finding its limitations outweighing its benefits, the search is on to locate alternative approaches. The task is to break out of the conceptual cul-de-sac of quantitative methods.

A major pull toward qualitative research, as seen by Rist, is the Federal government's change within the past five years in funding strategies. As those within the Federal system are hounded by increased concerns with accountability and the effective "targeting" of resources, the pressure has mounted to turn to those approaches
that provide a "close-in" and "hands-on" approach. The encouragement
of more field methods by the federal-funding sources appears to be an
effort to answer the question, "What is really going on out there?"

As steady state funding becomes a reality, the task is now one
of choosing among alternative and competing social/educational
programs. The demand is for an evaluative strategy allowing
assessment of impact at the local level. This incentive for qualita­tive research compiled with the variety of personal and institutional
incentives in American educational research "to follow the bucks" has
produced a proportionate rise in the level of interest in the research
community. "This may be one of the few nondisputable correlations

The use of ethnography is, now more than ever, institution­
alized as a viable tool for the research community. In the final
analysis, the issue is one of utility, not morality.
CHAPTER III
PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION

The purpose of this study is to provide a comprehensive
description and documentation of process related to the concep­tualization, development, implementation and evaluation of an early
screening and early intervention program. Programs, as observed by
this researcher, develop for a variety of reasons, e.g. political
awareness, power and control, requested by a sufficient number of
persons, or a sub-set of a broader program or hierarchy. A program
develops because of (1) an awareness of a need (conceptual awareness),
and (2) the commitment of individuals and groups to change an existing
interaction or structure (implementation of a process). The Early
Screening and Early Intervention Project emerged from an awareness of
needs expressed by parents, teachers, administrators and community
persons with an interest in early childhood education, as well as uni­versity faculty and students. In collaboration with school district
personnel, these individuals and groups committed themselves to the
development and implementation of a program designed to support
parents in their roles as prime educators of their children.

This chapter will describe and document the process of concep­tualization, development, implementation, and evaluation of the
screening and intervention project for prekindergarten children. The
step-by-step project design will be elaborated upon and linked to the implementation process of screening and intervention.

**Project Conceptualization**

**Problem Identification**

An awareness or perception of a need often surfaces because of an identified problem. The problem is identified through a pattern of behaviors or lack of behaviors. The perception of "what needs to be done" to change the "discomfort" caused by the problem varies with the "vested interests" of each individual or group involved. In this case, the "problem" surfaced through the "discomfort" described by four kindergarten teachers serving in two elementary schools within this school district. These teachers, averaging five years of teaching experience with kindergarten children, were becoming increasingly concerned with the wide developmental spread seen among entering kindergarten pupils. They expressed a need to "close the gaps" that existed in skill development so that they would have a chance to be more effective teachers in their classrooms and, thus, produce more effective learners.

School principals and administrative personnel (other "vested interest" groups) within the school district had become uncomfortable with the lack of co-ordination and consistency in the assessment methods used in a screening program at the four elementary schools identified within the district to be in the Teacher Corps Project. These four schools were located within the lowest income areas of the district. Their concern was expressed to Teacher Corps personnel within the school district as well as to representatives from the university assigned to the Teacher Corps Project.
The Teacher Corps Project which united the efforts of the university and school district was a five year, federally funded project designed to improve education for children of low-income families and to improve the educational personnel development system at the university. One of the stated thrusts of the Teacher Corps Project included the development of parents' skills.

In response to the concerns being expressed by kindergarten teachers, principals and district personnel, faculty from the university and district Teacher Corps personnel called a meeting to bring the concerned groups together. The intent of this meeting was to discuss these concerns and to see if the Teacher Corps Project could facilitate efforts to solve the perceived problems.

As a result of this initial meeting, a series of meetings was held during the fall of 1979. Not only did teachers and administrators within the district "brainstorm" problems of early assessment and prekindergarten skill development, but parents, community preschool persons, and Teacher Corps Interns shared their concerns and insights. (Interns are persons with previous experience in education, who have been trained by the Teacher Corps to teach in low-income communities.)

Within the school district there were few organized preschool programs which provided the early socialization skills which give a foundation for success upon entering the public school system. Although a respected Head Start program served the district and was housed in one of the four elementary schools within the district, there were too many low-income children within the district to be served by Head Start. The waiting list to enter the program was
extensive. The YM-YWCA within the district also had a good preschool program serving a limited population. Representatives from both Head Start and the YM-YWCA attended the meetings held during the winter of 1979 to share mutual concerns about preschoolers entering the public schools. They were concerned that inadequate communication existed between parents and schools; that parents were suspicious and fearful of public schools in general; that many parents did not possess the skills or knowledge to initiate school contact regarding concerns they had about their children's schooling. They also shared their feelings of inadequacy to meet the needs of so many low-income children in one district and called upon the school district for help.

The number of parents attending the initial meetings to identify needs in the district was disappointing. The three or four parents who did attend had been involved with one of the elementary schools as members of the Parent Organization (a local school service group), as room-mothers, or as volunteer helpers in the resource center (library and learning materials) of the school. These parents had shown interest in the school and had experienced a positive contact with the school prior to these meetings. These "select representatives" recognized the need within the district to have more parent involvement and communication with each local school. They shared their initial apprehensions about "coming to the school" and "helping teach the kids". They expressed a concern, which in no way is unique to the educational setting, that: "Not enough people want to take responsibility and do their share. A few of us do it all." When
asked what the teachers, principals and other school personnel could do to make parents feel welcome at the school, they suggested making contact prior to the beginning of school by phone or a visit. However, they recognized that such contacts are usually stressful and can cause problems. A phone call or a note home from the school usually means that the parent is "expected to do something about the child". Many of the parents in this district had poor school experiences themselves and feared the same for their children. The principal message given to school personnel from these few interested parents was: "Keep trying! Don't give up! If one thing doesn't work, try something else." Events that include a social time, refreshments, and a program featuring the children were given high endorsement. They also noted that parents like to hear, on a one-to-one basis, about their children. Parent-teacher conferences provide such an opportunity for an exchange of information.

The needs and concerns expressed at these meetings were as varied as the sources from which they came, but there emerged a consensus that the school needed to initiate a positive first contact with the home. It appeared that the district was being challenged to do more to help parents develop the skills needed to help their children prepare to enter the school. Certainly the concerns expressed from all groups and individuals at the meetings fit into many of the goals of the Teacher Corps Project. The three meetings held at one of the elementary schools in the district had been called by the Director of the Teacher Corps. The agenda was initially set by the Director, one school principal, and an education coordinator.
Addressing Concerns

This researcher became a part of the project when it was decided that action needed to be taken in response to the concerns expressed at the series of three meetings. As a Graduate Research Associate in the Department of Early and Middle Childhood Education at the university, I had been assigned to the Teacher Corps Project. My background experience included eleven years in education as a classroom teacher and as a university faculty member in child development, human services, and counseling. I had also served as a college administrator in continuing education.

Careful review of the concerns expressed led to the conclusion that the problems under investigation could only be "tackled" through a holistic approach to assessing needs. By this was meant that not only was it necessary to find a way of objectively gathering data, but even more importantly, there was a need to understand the "subjective reality" affecting the interactions of the persons involved. The efforts needed to be in program development and documentation of the process.

What information was required about the prekindergarten children entering the district in the coming fall? How could this information best be obtained? How could the information be used to help prepare the children for a successful kindergarten experience? How could parents be informed of their children's needs? How could parents be actively involved in helping their children prepare for school? How could the school make that "initial positive contact"? Could the information gathered on an individual child's needs be put
in a form that could help kindergarten teachers be more effective? What materials could be developed to help parents and teachers work together with a "mutual understanding" of the child's pattern of growth? The meetings continued during the winter and spring of 1980. A plan of action utilizing the efforts of teachers, administrators, project personnel, parents, and university faculty began to take direction.

**Project Development**

A seven step plan of action (see Appendix A) was envisioned by this researcher as a sequential time line for responding to the multiple needs and problems expressed. The meetings which had already taken place had provided an identification of need as well as a commitment from the school district, the Teacher Corps Project, the parents and other community early childhood persons to an intervention type of program.

Step one the Identification of Need resulted from the concerns expressed by the participants in the series of three meetings within the district. Step two of Commitment to the Early Assessment (screening) Project evolved out of the shared concerns of school, community, and the university. These shared concerns began to focus on gaining information on the prekindergarteners preparing to enter the district in the fall. At that point, this researcher joined the project and began data collection on the possible assessment instruments to be used in screening prekindergarten children. Step three of Research Analysis of Existing Assessment Tools was the responsibility assigned to this researcher by the meeting participants. The Santa
Clara Inventory of Developmental Tasks was the suggested and accepted instrument. Step four of the Assessment Process included the training of assessors by this researcher, the actual assessment process or screening of prekindergarten children, as well as the development of readiness materials to be used by the parents. Step five included the Performance Phase of Intervention where the learning materials were distributed by Teacher Corps interns into the homes of pre-kindergarten children. Step six was the Fall Screening process which provided up-dated profile information on each child now in the kindergarten setting. The final step, Step seven, was the Conference/Interviewing and Program Evaluation which focused on the interaction of program participants and the evaluation of the screening/intervention process.

The Seven Steps to Intervention was a reflection of the Teacher Corps Project’s year of "implementation". This was the third year of a five year project attempting to develop collaboration among parents, school, and community. The seven steps would develop a program which would aid in the transition of the child from the home to the school setting.

**Research and Analysis of Existing Assessment Tools**

The four elementary schools in the district were given the choice of continuing the screening assessment process that had been used previously in the district or to field test a more thorough instrument which would be selected by district participants attending the Teacher Corps meetings. The district had previously collected information on each entering kindergarten child through a registration
Form (see Appendix B). This form would continue to be used by all four schools. A Checklist of Skills (C.O.S.) developed by district personnel (see Appendix C) was the screening instrument used previously with prekindergarten children. Each school principal, with input from the education coordinators and kindergarten teachers, would decide whether to continue the use of the C.O.S. or to use the instrument to be suggested by the participants in the district meetings.

This researcher was assigned by the Teacher Corps Director the task of analyzing existing developmental assessment instruments. The researcher used an Education Resource Information Center (ERIC) search and university library facilities to review existing instruments for the screening of prekindergarten children. The Santa Clara Inventory of Developmental Tasks was selected based on two prime considerations: (1) that the instrument showed sequential development of the child in tasks related to gross and fine motor development (large and small muscles), perceptual and auditory skills (seeing and hearing), and conceptual processing (understanding and use of ideas, i.e. letters and numbers) skills, and (2) that the instrument was correlated with specific learning tasks.

The Santa Clara Inventory of Developmental Tasks was designed as a part of the Elementary and Secondary Educational Act (ESEA) Title I grant in a project conducted by the Santa Clara Unified School District, Santa Clara, California. In the summer of 1967 the staff of the Santa Clara Unified School District reviewed the models developed by Gesell and Ilg, Frostig, Piaget, Kephart, Montessori, and others.
Staff designed sample items for each of the eight identified developmental areas. Based upon a program of field testing involving 2,200 teachers throughout the U.S. from 1967 through 1973 items were added, deleted and modified. The progression of items were adjusted in the Observation Guide and formed into a hierarchy of skills. The Observation Guide contains a developmental profile for each individual student. A profile allows the teacher to record each child's progress. This graphic representation helps to determine the child's preferred learning modality. The profile enables the teacher to prescribe individual tasks for children when they are ready, and to skip the skills they have already mastered. The profile shows an approximation as to where the child should be functioning as well as the specific skills which are to be mastered. Four age levels are identified: preschool, 5-5½ years, 6-6½ years, and 7 years.

This researcher presented the instrument, its administration, resulting developmental profile (see Appendix D) and the sequence of related tasks to the meeting participants. The district representatives were highly supportive of this recommendation, as the Santa Clara material for screening had been previously purchased by the district for use in special education classrooms. (This researcher, community, and university representatives were unaware of this fact until the researcher had presented and suggested the instrument.) The kindergarten teachers were appreciative of the related developmental tasks which could be used in their classrooms. These task recipes were contained in the "Santa Clara Plus", an addition to the original Assessment Instrument and Observation Guide, which had previously been
purchased by the district. The Teacher Corps Director agreed to purchase the Santa Clara Plus, which included a box of developmentally sequenced learning tasks coded to match the eight areas on the profile (see Appendix D). The Santa Clara screening instrument had not been put into use in the special education classrooms due to a lack of training in the assessment process. The district Title I Director agreed to locate the Santa Clara Instruments and Guides and give them to this researcher for use in training assessors.

Two of the four elementary schools which had been regularly represented at the meetings by their education coordinators, kindergarten teachers, and a principal made the decision to use the Santa Clara for the spring screening of prekindergarten children. This choice was supported by a number of considerations. The Santa Clara permitted a child's competencies and skills to be individually profiled on a developmental continuum. This continuum was appropriate for the assessment of preschool children. The instrument was relatively easy to administer. It took an average of 30 minutes to screen each child. It assessed eight developmental areas in a sequential manner, and these areas were directly related to specific task development. These tasks included both physical and cognitive development (motor and thinking skills). Parents could easily understand the resulting individual profiles. The instrument provided prescriptive programming for "mutual" use by parents and teachers with the individual child. It permitted both parents and teachers to concentrate their efforts on only those skills which had not been mastered. Finally, the individual profile produced by the Santa Clara
Inventory could be passed on from the kindergarten teacher to the child's first grade teacher.

Intervention—More than Assessment

Knowledge of a child's individual skill growth and development is only the beginning of joining parent and teacher, home and school in the on-going process of a child's development and "learning". The meetings continued. The most pressing problem was the organization of the assessment or screening of kindergarteners, which was scheduled to take place in the spring. The principal and the education coordinator at one of the participating elementary schools agreed to coordinate the logistics of scheduling, communicating with the home, and preparing the facilities for the screening process. The education coordinator and a kindergarten teacher assumed the same responsibility at the other school. This researcher agreed to train students in Early and Middle Childhood Education at the university to serve as assessors using the Santa Clara Inventory as the screening instrument.

The kindergarten teachers agreed that the Kindergarten Handbook given to parents at the spring screening session needed revision. This Handbook supplied information about the school district and its staff, the philosophy of the child's school, developmental growth of a five-year old, and how a parent might work with a child to enhance skills prior to kindergarten entrance.

It was the next "thrust" of these meetings which gave the project its "popular" title: "The Learning Barrel Project". In order to respond to the needs and problems stated earlier, it was agreed that the systematic collection of objective information on a child (i.e.
the developmental assessment) was of little worth unless it could be combined with an intervention program that would include the awareness and participation of both home and school.

The eight development tasks profiled on the screening instrument and the developmental "weaknesses" most often identified by kindergarten teachers in pre-reading and pre-writing skills served as the basis for the intervention. It was decided by the kindergarten teachers that "learning barrels" filled with games (tasks) would be constructed and distributed to the homes of children showing developmental weakness on the screening profiles. The Title I Director agreed to ask district administrators that an in-service release day be used by aides and teachers to develop barrels (large ice cream containers) filled with learning task games.

Those families identified during the spring screening process as most needing help to "bridge the gap" in preparing their children for fall kindergarten were invited to take part in the summer intervention program. These identified families would be composed of the primary caregivers (parents, grandparents, or guardians) of children with the largest number of task "weaknesses" as profiled on the Santa Clara Inventory of Developmental Tasks. Learning barrels with tasks related to a child's area of weakness were placed in the home by Teacher Corps interns. The barrels were to be used by the parent and child together in practicing readiness skills. Barrels were placed with a family for a period of two to three weeks and then retrieved by the intern. Another barrel was left with the family. The intern served as an agent in helping parents use the materials with the
children and in finding other resources in the community to support specific learning tasks. Often parents were unaware of library facilities, special community events, and events to support the learning process. The intern served as the initial on-going first positive contact between the school and the home. The school was willing to initiate contact with the home and family and to serve as a support service. Information obtained concerning the child and the family would be of value to the school and kindergarten teacher in "knowing the child and family" prior to school entrance. This early positive communication between home and school could be the beginning of an "open door policy" for both environments. Parents would be aware that they were respected and welcomed into the classroom, and teachers would be aware that they could contact the home.

In order to describe and document the skills of the children in the fall kindergarten classrooms, the Santa Clara Inventory of Developmental Tasks was again administered to all kindergarteners attending the two district schools in the autumn of 1980. The profile of task development which resulted from the assessment process served as a guide for teachers and parents. The individual child could be given the next appropriate task as numbered on the profile (see Appendix D). The profiles served as a guide to appropriate curriculum development for the individual child. The screening instrument was administered by students from the university. The students were trained by this researcher in conjunction with their pre-service preparation in Early and Middle Childhood Education.
In order to analyze the key factors involved in the communication and interaction process between home and school which was an integral part of the screening and intervention project, this researcher undertook the responsibility of interviewing each participant. Interviews were held in conjunction with the fall parent-teacher conferences. Parents not attending their scheduled conference were contacted by phone and a home visit interview was scheduled with the researcher. Parents, kindergarten teachers and aides, district personnel, Teacher Corps interns, pre-service university students, and other project personnel were interviewed to ascertain the impact of the project and the feasibility of continuing the project in the future.

**Project Implementation**

In the Spring of 1980 the implementation phase of the "Learning Barrel Project" was underway. Assessors were trained by this researcher. Materials were assembled by teachers and Teacher Corps personnel for the learning barrel workshop. Interns were informed by the District Project Coordinator of their part in the summer distribution and retrieval of the barrels. Kindergarten teachers had developed and printed a new Kindergarten Handbook. The only limit placed upon the project's implementation was time.

**Training of Assessors**

The training of students in Early Childhood Education at the university in screening prekindergarten children (1) provided the school district with additional personnel for the project, (2) gave students (pre-service teachers) an early contact with a school
district and (3) gave an optional field-based component to an already existing course in Kindergarten Methods. Students selecting this option were trained by this researcher in the use of the Santa Clara Developmental Inventory. This gave undergraduate students preparing for teaching an opportunity to relate to children, teachers, parents and administrators during their preparatory, pre-service phase of education.

The assessment training module developed by this researcher was broken down as follows: (See Appendix E for details.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Training Session I</th>
<th>2 hrs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading manual and preparing materials</td>
<td>2 hrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Training Session II</td>
<td>2 hrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of Pre-kindergarten (spring) or kindergarten (fall) children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 1</td>
<td>6 hrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 2</td>
<td>6 hrs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The training resources used in the assessment training module were the Santa Clara Developmental Inventory and the Child Assessment Manual. The Child Assessment Manual was developed by Dr. Carol Gray, University of Washington, for the Region X Head Start Office of Training and Technical Assistance. The assessment training module in conjunction with the Kindergarten Methods Course provided students with the opportunity to (1) put theory into practice, (2) make direct
contact with students, parents, teachers, and administrators, and
(3) evaluate instruments and materials supporting sequential learning
tasks.

Spring Kindergarten Screening

Children qualifying for entrance into the school district, who
by legal birthdate would be five year's old by September 30, 1980,
were invited to take part in a prekindergarten screening program held
at the school they would be attending. Children attending both
elementary schools were scheduled for screening upon arrival at the
school building during a two day period in May of 1980. Children and
their parents were greeted by the education coordinator, the prin­
cipal, or parents from the school's parent organization. At one
school, ice cream cone name-tags were pinned on each child. These
name-tags were "traded in" for a real ice cream cone when screening
was completed.

Children at one school waited in a "playroom" and were super­
vised by parents and aides for a short time until a student assessor
was available. A Teacher Corps intern played with each child while
waiting and then helped the child make the "transition" from playroom
to the gymnasium where the screening took place. If needed, the
intern stayed with the child as long as necessary until the assessment
process was successfully underway. Only a few children were unable to
complete the 20 to 30 minute screening process. This was due to their
own discomfort (fear of new surroundings, shyness, immaturity in
staying with a task).
Children at the other elementary school, after being greeted at the door, were escorted with their parents to the Educational Resource Center at the school, where screening was taking place. As soon as an assessor was available, the child was introduced to the assessor by the intern, who often stayed with the child as the transition was made from person to person.

Parents at both schools attended a meeting with the kindergarten teachers, principal and/or education coordinator while their children were being screened. At this time the kindergarten program was explained and the new Kindergarten Handbook was distributed and explained. At one school a film of a current kindergarten class "in action" was shown. It depicted a typical day at kindergarten from children arriving off the bus to departing at the close of the day. The "Learning Barrel Project" was explained by this researcher to the parents. Parents were told that they might be contacted within the next two weeks and asked to participate in the summer intervention project if their child was identified as needing help in specific areas as identified on the screening profile. All parents were assured that the screening profile on their child would be shared and discussed with them individually during the fall conference with their child's kindergarten teacher. Parents were then given an opportunity to ask questions and discuss the kindergarten program, the assessment process, and the intervention project. Kindergarten teachers were available following the meeting to visit informally with parents and children and to guide a tour of the kindergarten classrooms.
The student assessors were able to screen 140 prekindergarten children planning to enter one of the two elementary schools that fall. The children were assessed on seven of the eight developmental task areas on the profile, which is a composite of the Santa Clara Inventory (see Appendix D). The "Auditory Perception" task area was not used since both visual and auditory screening were made available by the district nurse at a separate station during the two day screening process. Many persons were involved in the two day assessment. A "station" approach was used. This meant that several children could be screened at one time. The education coordinators had organized the time line for scheduling children and assessors so that the process was a smooth one. A sample time line for the kindergarten assessment by "stations" indicates this organizational process (see Appendix F).

The Learning Barrels

Project personnel collected ice cream containers to be used to hold the learning games or tasks designed and labeled by developmental area. Large ice cream barrels were covered with contact paper and decorated to represent the content area (i.e. large ears made from construction paper protruded from the "Sounds" barrel). The name of each barrel was printed on the outside, and a list of how to use the contents was printed on the inside. The barrels included the seven areas screened on the Santa Clara. The content games supporting these areas were designed by the teachers, aides, parents, education coordinators, Teacher Corps personnel, one principal and this researcher. Each participant selected a task area and created three
games to support the learning of that task. Construction materials needed were purchased by the Teacher Corps Director and this researcher.

The seven areas screened on the Santa Clara Inventory and the barrels that were developed to strengthen these areas are listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Santa Clara Areas</th>
<th>Learning Barrels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motor Coordination</td>
<td>Gross Motor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the use of muscles in</td>
<td>walking on a beam, jumping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>performing a physical</td>
<td>rope, hopping games</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>task</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Motor Performance</td>
<td>Fine Motor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eye-hand coordination</td>
<td>stringing beads, cutting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with scissors, tying shoes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Perception</td>
<td>Letters and Colors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>matching of color, size,</td>
<td>match colors, shapes, words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shape, design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Memory</td>
<td>Visual Memory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recall, name, reproduce</td>
<td>name objects from memory,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>recall items in sequence,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>reproduce a design from memory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditory Memory</td>
<td>Sounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>identify, discriminate,</td>
<td>identify common sounds,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>match sounds</td>
<td>recognize differences in pitch,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>match rhyming sounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Development</td>
<td>Language Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>describe, relate, define</td>
<td>describe objects, define words,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tell stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual Development</td>
<td>Numbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>number value, relationships</td>
<td>order numerically, assign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>relationships, sort objects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was decided that, ideally at least, one barrel for each of the designated areas should be available in each of the four kindergarten classrooms. However, due to the time element and expense of construction, it was decided that for the pilot phase of the project
two barrels for each learning area would be assembled at an in-service workshop.

The Learning Barrel Workshop

The school district agreed that both kindergarten teachers and aides would take part in an in-service workshop where barrels could be assembled. The workshop was an all day event held in the Educational Resource Center at one of the elementary schools. The Teacher Corps Project purchased materials for the construction of the learning tasks. Aides worked throughout the day assembling the learning tasks and decorating the barrels. Kindergarten teachers attended the workshop off and on throughout the day, depending on their classroom schedule and arrangements for their release, which varied by building and classroom. Teacher Corps interns also took part, along with other district personnel, including education coordinators and a principal. The University Teacher Corps Director, one kindergarten teacher and this researcher assumed responsibility for facility arrangements, refreshments, and coordination of material construction and placement of the materials in each barrel. At the end of the workshop most of the barrels were completed. One kindergarten teacher agreed to take responsibility for completing the barrels. Each barrel contained materials for three sequential developmental tasks in the same area and instructions on how to use the games. Everyone involved expressed a sense of satisfaction at seeing the project now having "substance" through the attractive barrels and the creative materials which "they had developed".
Linking the Assessment Process to Barrel Distribution

The week immediately following the spring screening, the profiles on each child were studied and sorted by the kindergarten teachers, education coordinators and a principal. Initial sorting was done by the teachers at their convenience, then re-sorted by the coordinators and the principal. The profiles were sorted into three categories as determined by the number of tasks accomplished in each developmental area in relationship to age category. Of the 140 children screened, 40 had profiles indicating either an extreme weakness in task achievement in two or more of the developmental areas or a low number of tasks accomplished across all task areas. The goal of the project was to remediate, through an intervention program, an obvious learning deficiency, as well as to identify specific areas of limitation. The 40 families of the identified children were contacted by telephone by this researcher or a member of the Teacher Corps staff. Each family was invited to attend a meeting with a kindergarten teacher and this researcher at one school and with a kindergarten teacher and the education coordinator at the other school. The objective of the meeting was to explore the possibility of the parents' participation in the summer intervention project (the Barrel Project). A few parents could not be contacted by phone, so a letter was sent out from the schools. Of the 40 families contacted, 30 came to one of the meetings. All 30 agreed to take part in the intervention project.
The "parent" or primary caregiver representing the family included mothers, a few fathers, and a grandmother. Each parent met separately with an education coordinator, kindergarten teacher, or this researcher to discuss the results of the screening. The parents seemed to understand the profile. The profile gave a view of the individual's task development by age. Children were not compared. Each parent left the conference with a learning barrel designated as appropriate for his child's needs. Many children had accompanied their parents to the conference, and they left carrying "their barrel". Parents were told that a Teacher Corps intern would be calling them in the following three weeks to set up a time to come to the home and exchange a new barrel for the old one. It was planned that over the summer each child would have the use of three barrels. The kindergarten teacher at one of the schools agreed to keep records on which barrel went to each family. She also volunteered the use of her classroom throughout the summer for the storage and distribution of the barrels.

**Intervention—The Barrel Project**

Four Teacher Corps interns were assigned the task of distributing the barrels throughout the 10 week period. One intern at each school took the first part of the summer, and a second intern at each school was responsible for the second part of the summer. Each intern was to telephone the parents to set up a time to pick up one barrel and bring a new barrel to the parent and child. This visit also provided an opportunity for the intern to (1) assist the parent in teaching the child by modeling interaction, (2) discuss the use of the
materials with the parent, (3) observe the interaction between parent and child, and (4) collect specific data or information that would help parent, child, and kindergarten teacher make an easier transition from home to school.

Fall Screening

During October of 1980, pre-service teachers enrolled at the university in the Kindergarten Method Course were trained to use the Santa Clara Developmental Inventory. Twelve university students volunteered for this field-based experience. This researcher again used the Assessment Training Module described previously for the Spring Screening assessors. The fall screening took place at the two elementary schools during the regularly scheduled kindergarten classes.

Of the 30 children participating in the summer intervention project, 29 attended kindergarten at the two schools and were available for the fall screening. The spring screening documented the remedial needs of each of these children on the profiles. These profiles served as a guide for parental involvement and support in the use of the learning barrels. The fall screening then served to document the updated profile on each child for teacher involvement and support of use of the learning barrel tasks in the classroom setting. The fall screening was administered to all children attending kindergarten at the two elementary schools. The education coordinators, Teacher Corps interns, as well as the university students were involved in the fall screening. The fall screening took place at another available room within the school, as children were
removed individually from the kindergarten class to be screened by an assessor.

Conference Sharing of Profiles and Parent Interviews

During the regularly scheduled fall parent/teacher conferences, the kindergarten teachers shared the screening profiles on each of the children with their parents. Children who had been screened in the spring had two profiles to be compared. Teachers went over each of the developmental areas on each of the profiles. This was an opportunity to discuss the child's growth and learning patterns. For parents who participated in the summer intervention project, this was an opportunity to discuss how the barrels were used and how the results on the profiles related to the use of learning task materials. For children who took part in the fall screening only, this was an opportunity to discuss how parents and teachers could work together using learning task recipes and games to reinforce skill development. Parents could be involved in helping children learn new skills by volunteering to come into the classroom or by taking learning barrels home. The decision for selection of materials to use with a child and how to use the materials could be discussed by parents and teachers. This was an opportunity for parents to become aware of the type of task work taking place in the kindergarten classrooms.

An invitation to the parents who had participated in the intervention project to share their attitudes and concerns about the project with this researcher was sent home by the school at the time of the fall conference. These interviews were scheduled for each family immediately following their regular conference time with their
children's teacher. These conference/interviews were scheduled over a two-day period in November of 1980.

Of the 29 families in the screening and intervention project, 11 came to the schools for the conference/interviews. Every attempt was made to contact the families who did not attend these scheduled conference/interviews. This researcher was able to schedule in-home interviews with 16 of the families who participated in the intervention project. Two additional interviews took place by telephone with this researcher. The parent question form was used as a guideline for both personal contact and telephone interviews (Appendix G). For this researcher the interviews provided an opportunity to gather information on parental attitudes and concerns about screening, intervention, and home-school relationships in general. For the parent the conference/interviews provided a time to gain awareness of the individual child's needs and skill development, to share concerns with the teacher, and to feel that their opinions about school assessment and home-school interaction were valued. An interview form (Appendix H) also served as a guideline to evaluate the summer intervention "Barrel Project".

Project Evaluation

This researcher, in an attempt to analyze the key factors influencing the impact of the intervention project, interviewed all persons directly involved in the screening and intervention process. The questions used as a guideline to direct the interviewing process are in the Appendixes G through K. Persons interviewed included four Teacher Corps interns, the two education coordinators, the principal
at one school, the District Director of Title I, the District Coordinator, parents, teachers and the two Teacher Corps directors. The Teacher Corps director originally with the project resigned during the summer to take a position at another institution, and another faculty member from the university was appointed to that position beginning in the fall of 1980.

Evaluation forms as well as taped interviews served to document the process of program evaluation. The interview forms in the appendix served as a source of written documentation. The tapes of the interviews served as accurate recall of the comments and evaluations shared by all participants verbally. These tapes were transcribed and are quoted from directly in Chapter V. The factors impacting change and attitudes were shared spontaneously through specific comments which seemed to be a "spin-off" from the directed interview questions. Specific questions seemed to "trigger" a pattern of thinking and a pattern of response began to evolve. The interviewing tapes gave a rich substance for understanding the population or community served by the project. These tapes, in conjunction with the profiles on each child, are the foundation for a comprehensive description and documentation of the program's development.
CHAPTER IV
DATA
ON THE SCREENING PROCESS
AND
PREScribed LEARNING MATERIALS

The early screening and intervention program focused on 24 children and their families who were the participants in a three-fold process of (1) spring prekindergarten screening, (2) summer intervention, and (3) fall kindergarten screening. The purpose of this study was to provide a comprehensive description and documentation of process related to (1) conceptual issues, (2) design issues, (3) implementation issues, and (4) evaluation issues. In support of the description and documentation process this chapter will present the data collected on the children through the use of the screening instrument. A second set of data in the form of transcribed participant interviews will be presented in Chapter V.

Data collected on the kindergarten readiness of each of the 24 children will be presented in three tables. Table 1 profiles each child's task achievement by category for the spring screening using the Santa Clara Inventory of Developmental Tasks. Table 2 also shows the learning barrels used by the children and their parents during the summer intervention. Table 2 gives a cumulative profile of each
The child's task achievement on the Santa Clara Inventory of Developmental Tasks for the fall screening. Table 3 gives a cumulative profile of each child's task gain by category between the spring and fall screening. Table 3 also shows the total number of new tasks learned by the child during the 5 month period between the spring and fall screenings.

Results of the Screening Process

One hundred forty prekindergarten children were screened on the Santa Clara Inventory of Developmental Tasks in the spring of 1980. Forty of these children, representing the lower one-third of the groups on task development on the resulting Developmental Profile were chosen for the one final sample (See Appendix D). The determination of which children fit into this category was made by the education coordinators and kindergarten teachers. Those children determined to be in the lower one-third showed a low profile in general or a profile weakness in several specific areas. Of the 40 families with children identified as needing intervention, 30 agreed to participate in the summer project. Of the original 30 children, 22 completed the three-fold process of spring screening, summer intervention, and fall screening. Two additional children, one from each of the two participating schools, were added to the project upon the request of their parents. These children were developmentally delayed in two or more categories. A total of 24 children completed the project.
Developmental Profile

The Santa Clara Inventory of Developmental Tasks is displayed in a profile of task development (See Appendix D). The eight task categories range from motor coordination to conceptual development. Level of difficulty is defined by acquisition of skills in relation to chronological age. Since motor coordination skills are learned at an early age, there are more tasks (11) in the motor coordination category. Since the child is approximately 5½ years of age before tasks are performed in the conceptual development category, there are fewer tasks (4) in this category. Each of the eight developmental categories is by number-coded in each task box on the Developmental Profile. In addition, there is a second code number in each box indicating tasks within category, with task two in a given category being more difficult than task one.

Spring Profile Diagnosis

Table 1 gives a cumulative profile of the task categories and the number of tasks achieved in each category by each of the 24 children. For example the first child, identified as child #1, successfully completed eight tasks in motor coordination. This child as profiled on the Santa Clara was able to perform in the 5 to 5½ year age category. Motor coordination was not an area identified as needing remediation through intervention. However, in both visual motor performance and visual memory categories child #1 performed at level six on task achievement. On the Developmental Profile a level six in these two specific categories falls within the preschool age
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>#2 #4 #7</td>
<td>#2 #3 #8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>#3 #7 #8</td>
<td>#3 #8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>#1 #2 #4 #6</td>
<td>#4 #6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>#2 #3 #7 #8</td>
<td>#3 #8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>#1 #6 #7</td>
<td>#7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>#3 #4 #7</td>
<td>#3 #4 #7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>#3 #4 #7</td>
<td>#3 #4 #7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>#3 #4 #8</td>
<td>#3 #8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>#4 #6 #8</td>
<td>#2 #3 #8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>#7 #8</td>
<td>#3 #8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>#6 #7 #8</td>
<td>#3 #7 #8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>#2 #4 #6</td>
<td>#3 #6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>#2 #6 #8</td>
<td>#3 #8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>#2 #4 #8</td>
<td>#2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>#3 #4 #8</td>
<td>#3 #8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>#1 #6 #8</td>
<td>#3 #8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>#3 #4 #6</td>
<td>#3 #5 #9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>#2 #4 #6</td>
<td>#4 #6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>#2 #4 #6</td>
<td>#4 #6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>#1 #3 #8</td>
<td>#1 #3 #8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>#1 #2 #4</td>
<td>#1 #2 #6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>#2 #5 #6</td>
<td>#2 #5 #7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>#3 #6 #8</td>
<td>#3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>#4 #7 #8</td>
<td>#3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Developmental task categories were scored on the Santa Clara Inventory of Developmental Tasks. Range of tasks in each category varied by task area with increasing difficulty from motor coordination beginning with a "1" to conceptual development with task "11" as the highest. A column for conceptual development is omitted as none of the children completed a task in this category. A line _ indicates inability to perform any task in this category.
range of task development. Child #1 was diagnosed as needing remediation through intervention in these two categories.

This profile served as a diagnostic tool. The materials which were developed into learning task games served as "prescriptive" materials for remediation of developmental weaknesses as profiled by the inventory. The parents served as the prime educators of their children in the summer intervention which used the learning materials to strengthen readiness for entrance into kindergarten.

**Prescriptive Learning Tasks**

The "barrels" of learning tasks and games which were used by the children and their parents in the home setting during the summer intervention project were correlated with the task areas of the Santa Clara Profile as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area Profiled on Santa Clara</th>
<th>Learning Barrels of Tasks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. motor coordination</td>
<td>1. gross motor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. visual motor performance</td>
<td>2. fine motor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. visual perception</td>
<td>3. letters and colors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. visual memory</td>
<td>4. visual memory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. omitted (screened by nurse)</td>
<td>5. none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. auditory memory</td>
<td>6. sounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. language development</td>
<td>7. language development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. conceptual development</td>
<td>8. numbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. body parts (added by a teacher)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the preceding list implies a child needing remediation in motor coordination (area 1), for example, should have worked with the materials in barrel #1 (gross motor). However, in referring to Table 1 and using Child #1 again as the sample child, we can see that this child used learning barrels #2, #3, and #8. Barrel #2 correlated with the need for task development in area #2. However, barrels
#3 and #8, although supportive of visual memory task development, were not prescribed. If a barrel was not available for use, barrels were often substituted. A chart of Prescribed Learning Barrels was made by one of the kindergarten teachers and served as a reference for barrel placement over the summer. It was the responsibility of the Teacher Corps Interns to refer to this chart and place the barrels accordingly. If the appropriate barrel for a child was not available a substitute was made. If barrels were not retrieved from a home as scheduled, again a barrel was substituted.

**Fall Profile Diagnosis**

The fall screening of kindergarten children in the two elementary schools in the district was a continuation and adaptation of the earlier spring screening process. It served as an up-dated description of the children who had been screened in the spring and had completed the summer intervention project. The individual developmental profiles which resulted from the fall screening had the potential of serving as the basis for diagnostic and prescriptive work with children in the kindergarten classrooms. In addition, the Santa Clara Plus, consisting of "recipes" of tasks based on the profiles, was available for use in each classroom. These prescriptive task recipes were cards of games and learning experiences which were coded to each task area on the profile. The profile could document where a child was developmentally, and the task card could give suggestions or prescriptions for giving the child practice for arriving at the next level of task development. As the spring screening had served as a guide for parent-child interaction on task development in the home
setting, the fall screening could serve as a guide for teacher-child interaction on task development during the kindergarten year.

Table 2 gives a cumulative profile of the task categories and the number of task achievements in each category by each of the twenty-four children. Referring to the results of the fall screening process as documented in Table 2, it can be seen that child #1 can now complete task #8 in the area of visual/motor performance. In referring to the Santa Clara Developmental Profile (See Appendix D), it can be seen that task #8 in the area of visual/motor performance is categorized in the age range of five to five and one half years. In this area of development Child #1 was performing appropriately for his age as categorized by this inventory. In referring to Child #1 for task accomplishment in the area of visual memory, it can be seen that he was still at level #6. According to the Developmental Profile he was functioning in the preschool age range. Child #1 needed remediation in task development in the area of visual memory.

**Recipe Cards and Learning Barrels**

The Santa Clara Plus consists of recipe task cards which support the areas profiled on the Santa Clara Inventory of Developmental Tasks. It was provided for each of the four kindergarten classrooms by the Teacher Corps Project. These recipe cards were directly coded by each developmental category and level of task. Child #1 was now ready to practice the games and skills which were designed to lead to successful accomplishment and documentation of success in the next task. The use of the recipe cards and/or the continued use of the learning barrels was the decision of each
Table 2
Cumulative Profile of Task Categories
Fall Screening

| Child by number | Level of Developmental Task Achieved | Recipe cards or barrels
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Developmental task categories were scored on the Santa Clara Inventory of Developmental Tasks. The range of tasks in each category varied by task area with increasing difficulty from motor coordination beginning with a "1" for each category scored is the highest level of development achieved by each child. A line indicates inability to perform any task in the category.

Recipe cards or learning barrels were to be prescribed by individual kindergarten teachers. The level of development of each child provided the "diagnostic" profile for the "prescription" of tasks through the use of Recipe Cards or Learning Barrels.
kindergarten teacher. Table 2 provides a column for the prescription of recipe and/or barrel tasks to be documented by the individual kindergarten teacher. This documentation process could be used in the classroom setting, in the home setting with parents, or it could be the source of communication between the classroom and the home for mutual understanding and support of the developmental progress of the individual child.

Task Gain Profile

Table 3 provides cumulative data on the task gain accomplished by each of the 24 children between the spring and fall screening. Child #1, as seen in Table 3, accomplished one task higher in motor coordination when his spring and fall screening profiles were compared. The final column in Table 3 gives the total number of task gains for each child. Child #1 accomplished eight tasks more on the entire screening profile as documented on the fall screening compared to the previous spring screening. His greatest gain in tasks by category was in auditory memory. The Developmental Profile on each child was shared with the parents at the fall conferences and interviews. Parents who had participated in the intervention project had the opportunity of seeing and discussing the progress of their children. The conferences and interviews also provided an opportunity to invite parents to continue working at home with their children, to participate in the classroom using the learning barrels, and to be aware of and support task development.
Table 3
Cumulative Profile of Task Gain
Spring to Fall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child by Number</th>
<th>Motor coordination</th>
<th>Visual/motor performance</th>
<th>Visual perception</th>
<th>Visual memory</th>
<th>Auditory memory</th>
<th>Language development</th>
<th>Conceptual development</th>
<th>Total number of task gain per Child</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In interpreting the data on task gain presented in the cumulative profile in Table 3, several possible occurrences need to be taken into consideration: (1) Maturational Effects: the normal developmental changes which occurred in each child during the time lapse between the spring and fall screening (five months). (2) Test Effects: the awareness of the testing process and the familiarity with the materials used through the intervention process as well as the use of the same instrument for the spring and the fall screening. (3) Classroom Exposure: the six weeks of classroom experience prior to the fall screening may have varied from child to child and from classroom to classroom. (4) Regression Towards the Mean: the simple statistical truism that when subjects are selected because they deviate from the mean on some variable, regression will occur. This regression effect has often been interpreted as a treatment effect.

The focus on task gain represented by Table 3 needs to be on the reinforcement of task accomplishment and individual growth and learning rather than on statistical significance or insignificance of documented change in task accomplishment. The emphasis was on the description and documentation of a process. The significance of the intervention process needs to be focused on the increased communication between parent and child and home and school which resulted from the use of the learning materials. The impact on positive communication and attitudinal changes which occurred through the use of the learning materials is presented in a second set of data in Chapter V.
CHAPTER V
DATA AND ANALYSIS OF THE PROCESS
BASED ON
PARTICIPANT INTERVIEWS

The purpose of this study was to provide a comprehensive description and documentation of process related to (1) conceptual issues, (2) design issues, (3) implementation issues, and (4) evaluation issues of an early screening and intervention project for prekindergarten children. The study focused on those children, their parents or guardians, and the school personnel who were affected by the interactive roles of those involved in the process. The data concerning the early screening and intervention project as seen from the perspectives of the participants is presented and analyzed in this chapter. Data in the form of transcribed participant interviews will be quoted directly and analyzed.

The analysis is based on the evaluative comments made by the participants during a series of interviews held with this researcher in November of 1980. The interviews were taped with the permission of the participants. These transcriptions then were transcribed. The original recordings and transcriptions are being retained by this researcher. An interview form served as a guideline during the interviewing process (see Appendix G through K).
Twenty-nine parents were interviewed. Eleven of the parents interviewed attended the fall kindergarten conferences. They were interviewed in conjunction with the teacher's conference. Sixteen parents not attending the district conferences were interviewed in their homes, and the remaining two parents were interviewed on the telephone. Although 29 of the original 30 parents invited to participate in the intervention were interviewed, a total of 24 of the families completed all three phases of the project.

This chapter will analyze the data gathered from the participants as contained in the interview tapes. Portions of the transcribed tapes will be quoted directly. The comments shared by the participants reflect their attitudes and concerns in relation to the issues of program conception, design, implementation, and evaluation. These attitudes and concerns support much of the material covered in the Review of the Literature. The analysis will link the participants' comments to the literature review.

The participant population which was interviewed includes the following:

Teacher Corps Directors

During the project there were two different individuals who served in this capacity. The first director, a faculty member at the university who was appointed to this position, served on the project from the initial meetings in the fall of 1979 through the summer of 1980 during the intervention process. The second director, a faculty member at the university who was appointed to this position, came to the project in the fall of 1980 at the time of the fall screening and interviewing process.
District Project Coordinator

This person was a school district employee. He was housed in one of the participating school's buildings and was responsible for the day by day functioning of the project. He was accountable to both the district and the university for Teacher Corps involvement in the school, community and university. He attended most of the meetings on the screening and intervention project and was responsible for the interns.

Title I Coordinators

These persons were housed at the school district office as a part of their district administrative position. Because of the overlapping of the population served, these persons chose to keep themselves apprised of the project's development. Two persons filled the position during the project. In the fall of 1980, the person who had served as principal in one of the two pilot elementary schools was appointed to this position. She remained a strong proponent of the project and saw the possibility of the project's continuation under the Title I program.

Principals

The above mentioned principal who became the Title I Coordinator was an original supporter of the project. When the new principal took charge, she also was interested in and supportive of the continuation of the project. She was however, involved with other priorities in her new assignment. The principal at the other elementary school was never involved in the project and resigned due to illness. The education coordinator at this school was assigned the
principal's duties and viewed this as an unanticipated and additional responsibility.

Education Coordinators

These persons are housed in the school building to which their role is assigned. One coordinator was completely involved in the project and its coordination. She participated with the interns, teachers, parents and Teacher Corps personnel. The other building coordinator as mentioned above, was given the responsibility as an "overload" and gave little energy to the project.

Kindergarten Teachers

The four kindergarten teachers on the project represented the two pilot elementary schools. They each taught two sessions of kindergarten, so a total of eight classrooms of children were involved in the fall screening process. Three of the teachers were involved with the project from the initial meetings through the fall screening. One teacher was out on maternity leave during the spring screening and did not join the project until the fall of 1980. She showed the least support of the project and was not committed to the use of the Santa Clara Plus recipe cards or to the continued use of the learning barrels. She did agree to contact all parents prior to the start of the school year and was cooperative in participating in the conference and interview process. The data collected on each child is coded so that subjects can be tracked by teacher placement.

Classroom Aides

The aides enthusiastically participated in the construction of the learning barrels. Two of the aides participated in the
interviewing process along with the kindergarten teachers. The aides assisted in both the spring and fall screening and in working with children and parents in making the transition into the screening stations with the pre-service teachers.

Teacher Corps Interns

The interns participated in some of the meetings prior to the spring screening. They were active in the screening process as assessors or in working with parent and child. They were the persons responsible for the distribution and retrieval of the barrels over the ten week summer intervention. All four were active in the fall screening of kindergarten children.

Pre-Service Teachers (university students)

Twelve pre-service teachers preparing for elementary service were trained in both the spring and fall to assess the children. These twenty-four students participated in a training course as an option to a Kindergarten Method Course at the university.

Parents of the Children

Twenty-four families participated in the spring sessions with kindergarten teachers and this researcher to discuss screening profiles and learning task materials. Parents used one or more of the learning barrels with their children during the summer. All of these parents again participated in the fall conferences and/or interviews.

Interview Data

Perceptions of the Child: Use of the Profiles

According to Rowe (1977), until sufficient knowledge of the personal developmental characteristics of each one of the children in
the group is known, the teacher is only partly prepared for the task ahead. Parents also perceive themselves as eager to help their child settle into school. However, many parents find it difficult to make the initial approach to the teacher to find out how they might contribute. The attitudes and concerns shared by the project participants were supportive of the information shared by Rowe. One strength of the Santa Clara Inventory of Developmental Tasks is that it provides a diagnostic profile of the task development of the individual child. When the Title I Coordinator, who had previously served as a principal, was asked how she thought the profile on each child could best be used, she stated:

I like it (the Santa Clara) as a prescriptive device rather than a pre-post, and that is why we chose the Santa Clara rather than the California Test of Basic Skills or the Iowa. We stayed away from that as we wanted something prescriptive - something like the child does not know letters or how to hop, but the barrels gave the parents the opportunity to have these skills pointed out to them, and these are techniques you can use to help the child learn.

When asked if she thought parents could serve as the prime readiness educators of the child, she replied:

A parent doesn't really see their role as doing anything at all. They think they're going to send them (the child) to school, and they'll be able to do everything. Ten to 20 years ago that might have been the case. Kindergarten is now becoming an academic thing.

This principal/administrator's view of parent involvement was influenced by her many years of service in this district. She viewed the barrels as an outgrowth of a prescriptive device that gave parents "the opportunity to have these skills pointed out to them". She seems to fear that most parents perceive the responsibility of educating the child as the school's instead of theirs. However, she acknowledged
the academic demands of the district and the pressure now put on kindergarten teachers to teach academic skills.

In discussing the use of the Santa Clara Inventory, the District Teacher Corps Project Coordinator stated:

The Santa Clara is a good and reliable instrument in a diagnostic and prescriptive manner. I think pre and post documentation can serve as support, but the use (of the instrument) should be diagnostic and prescriptive.

Again the concern was shared that the Santa Clara not be used for categorizing children by pre- and post-test results. The stress again was on diagnosis and prescription.

One of the Education Coordinators supported these feelings in stating:

That is the beauty of it (the Santa Clara). You can take a child where he is and work on it - a tremendous link between home and school as it is simple enough for the parents to use.

She seems to be inferring that when materials that can be understood by parents, they will be used. Perhaps the problem was not a lack of interest by the parent towards the child's learning, rather there was a need for appropriate materials and the skills to use these materials.

When asked how they intended to use the profiles in their classrooms, two entirely different responses were given by a kindergarten teacher at one school and a kindergarten teacher at the other elementary school. One teacher, who had been actively supportive of the project, replied:

I will use the profiles in a prescriptive way with each child. I like the Santa Clara. This is the first year I was even aware of what instrument was used for screening in the district. I would like to use the materials like task cards in my class.
This teacher had gained a heightened awareness of the screening process and the instrument used. She also saw a way to adapt the skill information on each child to a process with which she was previously familiar, i.e., task cards.

Another kindergarten teacher who was on maternity leave when the program was developed had already decided not to follow-through on the use of the profiles in her classroom. She stated:

Profiles are very important. It is also important to get information on the child directly from the parent. Parents give accurate information. However, I do not plan to use the profiles this year in my classroom. It is just one more thing - and I wasn't here when all of this was going on - so they will probably just be set aside.

The above supports the premise that a person needs to be actively involved in the development of a program in order to have continued interest in its support. Without understanding and commitment, involvement seldom takes place.

When the new principal at one of the schools was questioned concerning her understanding and commitment to the use of the assessment profiles, she replied:

I really haven't had the time to get acquainted with all of the project yet. I haven't considered the tie-in to the kindergarten curriculum. I think we need to look at that and using the Santa Clara as too many kids are coming into kindergarten before they are ready. They go on to first grade and then our problems start to multiply. I think we'll follow through and use it (the Santa Clara) again next year.

Her awareness and concern with school readiness were apparent. She also was sensing a link between the kindergarten curriculum and how it might tie to other grades. Principals are usually given the final decision on promotion or retention of a child. This principal was aware of the need for early identification of
skills and the need for a plan for communicating this awareness from teacher to teacher, grade by grade.

**The Child in Two Worlds: A Perspective**

*from the School*

McPherson (1972) argues that the difference between teachers and parents arise from fundamentally different ways of viewing the child. She feels that "to wish a child well" does not mean the same thing to parent and teachers. Parents view the child in terms of long range plans and goals. Teachers are concerned with specific developmental and skill gains in the here and now.

The following attitudes and concerns shared by the participants appear to support McPherson's argument. Parents and teachers conceive of their roles in relationship to the child differently. Their support of the child in learning seems to stem from their attitudes about their roles as parents and as teachers.

In discussing their role in contacting parents, the following information was shared by the kindergarten teachers:

I contacted all the parents before school started and asked if they had any special concerns or questions. I found out a lot about the kids - and got some initial impressions. If this is a first school experience, the parents are new at it too - for instance, they question: "Do you let them go to the bathroom whenever they need to?"

This teacher was very positive toward the project and because of her initial involvement chose to make contact with each parent prior to the school year. She was sensitive especially to parents who were having a "first school experience" with a child. She realized that parents also have concerns and fears.
The other kindergarten teacher at the same school shared the following impressions of those initial contacts:

Printed material isn't read by the parents. I telephoned all parents prior to school in the fall. I reached about two-thirds of them. The parents were surprised I called. Then they started to relax and share concerns. It was helpful to me and them. This was the first time I've phoned before school started. We had no idea about the children last year - like brothers and sisters, things about the home, health problems.

The kindergarten teacher at one school who was not involved in the original development of the project made some suggestions about parent involvement:

A form to let you know more about the home situation would be helpful - but I feel the teachers and the district are already doing about all they can (to get parents involved). An interview with the parent prior to kindergarten during the screening would be helpful. The parent can give us a lot of information that screening cannot give.

When this teacher was questioned further about her experiences in parent contact and participation during her seven years in a classroom, she replied:

Parents are always invited (into the classroom), but then it is up to them. They are afraid to handle kids in a classroom situation. Don't know what to do! If there is a problem in the home, parents do let me know at an Open House or by note or at the conference. About 80% show up for the conferences and are very willing to give information.

The other kindergarten teacher at the same school was involved in all phases of the project, and this involvement was a factor in her appointment to a coordinator position with the district the next year. She also was concerned with the discomfort of parents in the classroom and offered some suggestions for change:

They don't know how to help children learn (parents). I think parent workshops would help. You can tell when parents come in (to the classroom) that they are uncomfortable and afraid. They don't feel confident about themselves. This year the Education
Association sent out pamphlets telling how to confer with the child's teacher and what to share at a conference. This makes parents feel a little more comfortable.

This teacher was aware of the discomfort and fears of parents. She also was aware that exposure to or information about the classroom situation can help parents become more comfortable and feel more adequate. Workshops including parents and educators can provide the exposure that leads to feelings of adequacy. Brochures giving skills or ideas can give parents the knowledge of what the school expects.

When these same teachers were questioned concerning the time and effort it takes for a teacher to help parents learn classroom interaction skills, they gave the following responses:

It is very difficult to get parents involved in this area (classroom participation). One or two parents each year are interested and willing. Sometimes it is best not to have the parent of a child in the classroom.

It depends on the parent. I have my aide - some parents don't know what to do. The use of task cards helps - some parents need constant direction - and it is more bother than it is worth.

Both teachers shared concerns about the extra time and effort involved in teaching parents how to work with children. When asked if the skills parents might gain through classroom participation could be put to use in the home, neither teacher responded. We discussed how a combination of school and home working together at skill development might, in the long run, take less time and energy. The education coordinator expressed her willingness to spend more time in teaching skills to parents, but felt for younger, less experienced teachers this would be expecting too much.

According to district personnel, parent participation at school was low. A few parents participated regularly, but many
parents appeared to avoid contact with their children's school. When I expressed this lack of parent participation to the new principal, she shared the following:

There is a lack of parent participation throughout the district, school wide, because these people do not have the time. These people are caught up surviving! This population is not the type that has time to say: "Play Bridge?" It's not that they don't care – they just don't have time. A lot of them work two jobs and are single parents. During a recent parent participation day there was a good turn out of about 30 parents. They were contacted through a newsletter, in fact two notices were sent home. Ten children used a babysitting service which we provided. As a new principal I need to get several things going in my building, and I'm not sure I can provide the "social atmosphere". I don't have the time at this time. It would be like free breakfast – as middle class America – I can't understand why someone can't take care of the child (younger sibling). I think I am not to provide free babysitting service – free breakfasts were just that – FREE! and so the kids took it, took one bite and threw it away. I finally said it: "You take it – You eat it! – but I think we can come to a happy medium – somewhere down the road.

This young woman principal, seemed to be aware of the needs and stresses of her parent population. She also identified with the needs of her students, as this also was the community in which she had attended school. Stress from economic pressure often leaves little time for "leisure activities". School participation becomes a low priority when "basic survival" is in question. The statement that: "It's not that they don't care – they just don't have time", supports the fact of parental concern for the child. White (1977) found that the three main obstacles parents face in trying to do their best for children are ignorance, stress, and lack of assistance.

If basic survival was high on the priority list for the families this project was designed to serve, then perhaps the statement by one of the kindergarten teachers is relevant:
Parents that were in Head Start are used to coming into the schools, but I think parents need a personal and specific invitation - "you're really welcome" - then they need to know what they can do. I think parents are shy about making the first move. They need to know you really need their help. This is the first year I called each parent prior to the start of school, and it made a big difference. I think it gives a parent a secure feeling.

The school system needs to be sensitive to the fears of parents as they expose their own academic "frailities" in helping their children learn. Some parents have unpleasant memories of their own school years and are unnerved by the prospect of talking face to face with a teacher about their children, but they are no less interested than other parents in their children's success (Canady and Seyfarth, 1979). Parents have fears. These fears often stem from feelings of inadequacy - not knowing what to do or how to do it. The interns who visited in the homes with parents during the summer intervention shared their insights into these parental fears:

Parents don't want to be bothered with teaching the kids. Many didn't even finish high school. School was unpleasant and troublesome. They don't have the basic skills themselves - alone to help their children. Often they are afraid that the child has already passed them (skill wise).

Another intern stated:

They are afraid of finding out their child isn't doing well. They didn't do well in school.

A key factor to project success appears to be helping not only the child but also the parent feel better about himself. One of the interns reflects the importance of caring about the individual:

An underlying attitude of caring about the kid has to be there. Providing babysitting will not make the difference - if you can do it, fine! But, an attitude of helping the kid first is the most important. Attitudes are shaped and formed - like Father Flannigan's work with kids - work with kids to help them
feel better about themselves. Schools have been degrading, dehumanizing experiences for kids. Kids don't want anything to do with them.

One of the education coordinators gave her views based on several years of experience with low-income families in inner-city schools:

My biggest plus was to contact parents early, before there were any problems. So the parent felt, "Mrs. S is pretty nice; she likes you! The barrel project was successful in that the parent knew that you cared a little bit more. Parents were so impressed when I took time out to call them. Any positive contact helps. I used to call everyone the first two weeks - contact helps - I finally got involved with too many elements that I couldn't handle it. It got very depressing, and I finally left - you know - health problems, abuse problems - it just really gets very depressing. I noticed this year at kindergarten registration how much difficulty they (the parents) had filling out the forms. I know when explaining things not to use "educational terms", so they would know what is going on. Normally the comments I hear, even from these parents, is that the school district is very good. "I know this is a good school because I went here", many have said.

The comments of this coordinator are supportive of the concern shared by Pause (1977) that parents should be regularly informed so that they can understand and support the work of the kindergarten. She stresses that early communication can prevent "disturbances, which manifest themselves in regression and aggression and thus hinder useful cooperation" (p. 28). When school personnel were questioned concerning an awareness of the type of community in which the children lived, it became apparent that the district was a divided one. Low-income and middle-class families lived as neighbors. Some areas were very typical middle-class suburban homes. Also in the area was a large mobile home park, as well as newly built low-income government apartments. About half the population was highly transient and the other half had lived in this area all their lives. Many of the
teachers had aunts and uncles of their present students as well as older siblings in their classes.

One education coordinator in describing the community said:

We have very little specific communication with parents in this area. The same involved few always talk about what is wrong. This project (the interviewing) was a unique opportunity to get an insight into what the community is thinking. About half our children are very mobile, like in the trailer park or the housing project. Some people have been here forever. Did you know the principal here actually went to school right here in this school? So many parents come in and say: "I went to school with her!"

For information on the community the new principal shared the following:

I went to this school district. You are sitting in my 5th grade classroom (her present office). I still live in this community as a divorced single parent. I lived in the trailer court as a child. This is a very in breed district. The community has changed—now have federal housing which probably is the reason for a lot more low-income families.

When examining the response of this particular class of parents to the barrel project, district personnel shared the following insights:

I don't think it (the project) has told us anything about the community we didn't already know. If you want to do something with the parents—do something with the kids—like Christmas programs. Parents are interested in the kids performance—still they are reluctant to come to school. When the parents were asked to bring the last barrel back to the school themselves, only 50% returned them.

The comments by the District Teacher Corps Project Coordinator were not supportive of the project having given new insight into the community served. When asked if he was aware of the project findings with respect to the number of parents wanting to participate and the number of fathers serving as prime caregivers in the home, he said he was not aware. His response shows a certain skepticism:
Parents claim they will volunteer, but I am actually skeptical that they actually would. I see the need for inservice and to use parents in the classroom, especially if you can get them at kindergarten or early grades. I think there is a natural enthusiasm early during the "breaking of the tie" between parent and child as the child starts school.

One of the kindergarten teachers also indicated that parents may not mean what they say, but this may not mean a lack of interest in the school or in helping the child.

I became aware of parents interests. If they said: "I don't want to mess with them (the barrels), that right there gave me an idea that the parent wasn't interested in the child. I feel I've had more communication with parents this year—don't know if it was because of the barrels, but it could be because of the project. More parents asked me to send papers home when a child has been absent. So, parents are aware that we will send things into the home.

In discussing the community and parental response to having learning materials brought into the home, one intern gave a rather humorous picture of the situation:

There is a great contrast in social, economic, and cultural styles—extreme in poverty and affluence. There were both positive and negative responses from parents at the extreme poles. One mother didn't want to work with the child. She didn't even appear to like the child and was very hostile toward me and the child. I told her, "No, it doesn't cost anything. It's free". "Are you a traveling salesman?", one parent asked (obviously upon arrival at a home with barrels in hand). Siblings often took part; even the dog and cat wanted to be involved. They loved tactile things and large motor materials. The homes were in close proximity. They saw you coming from another home and were sure you were selling your wares.

A teacher warned:

If you go into homes, have someone with you. This is not the type of area you go out alone in at night. Be careful!

One education coordinator felt that in this community efforts to include parents as part of the school would not be successful.
She felt that these lower income parents would not accept the responsibility of educating their children; this is the school's job.

Most of these are good stable people. They are very positive about the school district. I think the total element that we are dealing with now would be afraid to initiate contact with the school. The general parental attitude is: "I had them, you teach them".

The comments shared concerning the impact of the intervention program by school personnel would indicate that these people care but often wonder if their efforts have real meaning. The best source for getting information on program impact was the parents.

The Child in Two Worlds: A Perspective from the Home

Parents participating with their children in the summer intervention barrel project did so upon invitation. However, these parents were aware that the child had been selected to participate because of a developmental lag which was documented by the spring screening process. The parents came to the project with a wide range of skills. Many of the parents were from a low-income population. Most of the parents brought their own fears of a lack of ability to help their child as a teacher of skills. Only a few parents put the barrels aside in frustration. Two parents joined the project at their own initiation. All the parents participated by choice. The format for sharing the project with the parents is documented in Appendix L.

The parents' participation in the barrel intervention was supportive of the research by Bausell (1979) that the best way to improve student achievement is to increase parental teaching of children prior to school entry. The explanation of social class differences in achievement is that the experiences of children from
high socioeconomic status homes are more like the educational experiences in the school than those of children from lower socioeconomic backgrounds. The essential role of parents in the education of their children must be recognized and steps must be taken to encourage parental teaching at all socioeconomic levels.

One of the parents who requested to join the project gave her views on the experience:

The intern who brought the first barrel really didn't explain it. The girl who brought the second barrel did explain it, and I liked that better. There were plenty of materials. My daughter used a barrel for about half an hour each day. She asked to use it. All of us used them together—her dad, her sister and me. I would rate the project high as it really helped her a lot. I quit work last year. I'd like to help in her class and teach other parents to use the barrels. She didn't know her ABC's. She knew part of them, and it really helped her. When I registered her in the spring I heard about the barrels. I talked to her teacher. Then the secretary said I could use the barrels. We made it a game (the tasks). She would try to be the leader to show what she knew. She didn't learn them all, but she improved on what she did learn. I would like to see the program continue, because it is a good program, and we enjoyed it!

This parent seemed to already have the idea that learning can be fun. She also saw the experience as a flexible one that the child could initiate. Also, it was a family affair.

Not all parents are secure enough to let the materials be used flexibly. A major concern among parents is that the materials be used right! Right usually means how they want them used. Along with this insecurity comes the need for very specific directions on the use of materials. Many parents felt the need for better instructions, intern modeling, or a parent workshop. All of these are good suggestions and should probably be an on-going part of the project. Several
Parents shared their frustrations with the project or with their children:

We didn't use the barrels. I don't have patience. She won't do it, when I know she actually could. She writes her numbers—but she just didn't want to do it at all. I've had trouble with her. I tried all summer to get her to write her name. I even went to the store and bought some paper. She just wouldn't do it.

Another parent shared her frustrations in trying to get her child to do it her way:

It would have been easier if he showed me (the intern). They used them an hour a day—everyday—both the girls. Couldn't get her to do nothin—so I told her I wouldn't do um either. Some days she did it. Some days she didn't. Couldn't get her to do it my way—wanted to do it her way. She knows more than I thought she did—she knew what was in the barrels. This (the barrels) learns me better about her.

The above home was sparsely furnished. There did not seem to be any books or other materials for learning in the home other than the barrels. The mother's main concern in getting the child ready for fall kindergarten was toilet training, which was a problem. Again the problems are multiple.

Another parent shared her frustration and need for better understanding on how to use the barrels:

It would have helped if the intern explained the use of the barrels—not just for me, but the children too. Some of the materials were missing, and you couldn't do the games. Directions not always clear, so I didn't know if he was doing it right or not, for instance on the lacing cards.

A concern frequently expressed by parents was the lack of communication with the intern. Often interns interpreted their role as "dropping off" barrels, rather than serving as information sources and role models for the parents with the child in using materials.

The following concerns were expressed by parents:
He just didn't tell us how to use them (the barrels). So he (the child) found a way to use the barrels that were his own. I found it a disadvantage that no one explained the use of the barrels. It took my time to sit down and plow through the directions. I felt that it took my time, and I would have spent more time with the barrels had I not had to sit down and go through the directions first. He found out his own creative ways to play with the barrels which were not the ways we were suppose to. For instance, he would blow up the balloons and play with the balloons. He played with the hopscotch. I think the problem was in my case that it took my sitting down with the directions, and for some reason it was summer, and that was hard to do.

Another parent expressed this lack of communication as follows:

I wasn't sure how many materials we could use, or what if we lost a button or something. I'm still wondering if he could have kept the lacing cards, because he made something real cute. We weren't sure what was really ours to keep. I think the project as a whole was really good—just because it existed. A run through demonstration of materials would help. The idea (intervention project) is really good. I think you should have a learning session, or the intern could show a parent and child how (to use the materials).

Parents need lots of direction and support. They want to do "what is right" for the child. Like any new skill, learning to teach your own child takes time and self-confidence. One parent shared her desire to learn, her ideas for change, and some excellent ideas for follow-through:

Since the last barrel we had was missing the instructions, the lady told me how to do it, but I couldn't remember what she said. There were lots of materials. I just needed more help with how to do it. I'd go to the school to learn (like a meeting), but I need babysitting. She (the child) and I did them (the barrels) together. Even her three-year-old brother learned to count. He can count to 15 because of the barrels. I really like the program. I'd like to go to the school with her. I meant to go to the teacher conference, but I guess I just didn't. I have transportation and my husband can babysit. If the teacher would say something to me, maybe I'd go in (to school). The teacher has never called. I met her once, 'cause I had to take a sweater in to school. I used to go to that same school and my husband went to the
other school. Don't know much about it now, but it used to be a good school. I'd like for her dad and me to go into the school and meet the teachers. I have problems meeting people—just don't know how to meet people. I have a real bad problem there, but this is all right (for someone to come into the home). I feel O.K. at home, but I wouldn't be dressed like this (jeans and shirt). I had to return the last barrel—didn't mind that. We like to get out of the house. We'd go to the library to get the barrels. I'd go to a neighbors home and show her how to use them. I'd like to know how she (the child) is doing in school more better. I don't know that—report card wasn't good—like to know what we can do. I try to sit down with her with the letters she doesn't know. I think she has to learn at home too. We understood what she (the teacher) marked down on the report card and what was needed. We didn't know what to say (on the parent's comment section).

Many parents found it difficult to go to the school. Perhaps school for them was a negative experience. Parents were very aware of their appearances. If they don't have the money for clothes like the teachers, or they are overweight, this is often reason enough to avoid the school environment. The barrel project had the advantage of meeting parents in their own environments. The parent quoted above was ready for the next step of moving out of the security of her own home to the library or even a neighbors home. If parents, like children, develop sequentially or step by step, perhaps an alternative for sharing information on and modeling the barrels use would be in small neighborhood groups. Also parent workshops at the school with the teachers could serve as a relaxed non-threatening approach. Since parents are at different phases of communication and skill development, just like children, several learning options need to be available. Such options might include: one to one home visits, neighborhood small group meetings, workshops at the school, or district conferences for parents and teachers.
Parental Role Models: Fathers as Prime Educators

The presence or absence of the father in the home, or what Elkind and Weiner (1978) prefer to call inadequate fathering, likewise has implications for how well a child's intellectual capacity develops. Biller (1978), who is accumulating data to show that children profit from close relationships with fathers very early in their lives, claims that we have to educate men to realize the important impact they have on their children.

Often the parent most involved with the child in using the barrels in the home was the father. The following comments indicate that fathers as well as mothers are serving as prime educators of the child:

They (father and son) sat up at the bar and worked on things. He worked with him on his alphabet.

I (father) worked with him on things, or he would tear things up. I was laid off. Maybe I could go into the school and do something. I could probably get my mom to take care of the littler one. I would go into his class to help out. These are good schools—a lot better than the city schools. My wife went to a teacher meeting one night, and she liked that O.K. I was pretty proud (of his son). He was sixth in his class on the report card. The school can't bend over and do everything. They're doing their part.

This father, like many fathers with a blue collar occupation had been laid off. It appeared to be easier in this community for a woman to pick up a low-paying job as a waitress or clerk to help the family survive financially. This left the father at home as the primary caregiver. It also left the father with a lack of identity for himself in relationship to the child. The role model the father had once held as breadwinner was now ambiguous. New strength or power was given to the mother as a breadwinner.
This loss of power inside the home when the father is no longer the greater resource for the family financially, may well carry-over into the status of the father as perceived by the child. The father now in the home as the primary caregiver finds himself in a role he had not anticipated, had not chosen, nor has the skills to handle. Although the literature on co-parenting is increasing, this usually refers to middle class families. The families discussed in the literature are co-parenting by choice. These parents are fairly well educated, and usually both parents are employed. This was not the situation encountered in this interviewing process.

One father who worked three days a week took the major responsibility in using the barrels with all five children in the home. His enthusiasm about the experience is obvious in the following statement:

She (the child) really learned a lot from the barrels. But, the twins (age 7) even got more out of them, as they are immature and were held back a year. Five of the kids usually did the barrels together. I planned the event. They'd do it all day, but after 30 minutes they got a little rowdy, so we'd stop. My wife takes care of others' children. So the days I'm off, I work with the kids. It is a thrill to see what a child can and can't do with these barrels. The second time you get it out, there is a lot of attention given to it. There were some things I couldn't do—like skip and bounce a ball in a circle (he laughed at himself). It certainly wasn't boring. At first she (the child) didn't get the letters, but everyone helped her. I don't think you should make the barrels anymore difficult. You can't comprehend everything. The barrel instruction covered everything. If a parent can read that is enough explanation. All of the kids got a bang out of doing them instead of having to go watch the TV.

While interviewing a mother with a small son watching out the window for the bus to take him to afternoon kindergarten, the mother said that the father was the parent who had used the barrel with his son during the summer:
They do everything together (father and son). I used to work days, so the two of them play in the yard. He already knew all his letters and numbers.

The young boy listening to the conversation said:

Ask my dad! He knows how to do everything! We did those barrels together.

The fathers interviewed were very positive about the project and the opportunity to show their children how to use the materials. All except one of these fathers had a prekindergarten son. In this community men saw their role as the head of the household and the final decision maker on the welfare of the child. This included the child's attendance at school, discipline, and learning experiences in general. The following statement by one of the education coordinators indicated that fathers take an active role in this community with the child:

A large number of fathers bring children back to sign them in after being absent. I thought this was because they were going to and from work. However, I had more fathers than usual come into register their kids for school this year--not overwhelming but an increase. We have several kids whose mothers deserted the home, and they live with a father. Also we have a lot of "live-ins" in this area (male, unmarried to the mother, but living in the home). Our files say the mother is divorced, but there is a man in the home.

A kindergarten teacher at one school shared her awareness of the involvement of fathers with the children in her classroom:

A lot of mothers tell me that so-and-so is their father's child in every way. Fathers are definitely more involved than they used to be with the kids. Fathers won't do penmanship but will play games. Kids like the attention from their fathers. This is a nuclear community. It is like a small town, so I've been aware of more father involvement.
One of the Teacher Corps interns with a background in social service shared his insight on why fathers are more involved with children:

Roles are changing. They began changing in the 1970's. Women aren't home. A lot of fathers are laid off and are around the home more, so they get involved.

Participants in the intervention program at all levels expressed an awareness of an increase of father involvement. However, no plans to include fathers specifically in school functions or to acknowledge fathers as being available for school participation had been made. If awareness is the first step in taking action toward change, then this project had heightened the awareness of school personnel in the district as to the increasing accessibility of fathers as prime educators of the child.

Parents as Educators: Interns as the Home/School Linkage

Szczepanski (1977) discussed the early socialization of children and the importance of learning experiences that take place in the family. She felt that the child's manner of skill acquisition, as well as acquisition of knowledge, values and attitudinal patterns, are acquired from the family before entering kindergarten. Because of this she felt that kindergarten educators should be aware of family socialization processes.

The interns on the project were strongly aware of the family socialization process. However, how their role as educators was linked to this process was never clearly understood. Throughout the interviewing process and at all levels of project participation, the perception of the role the interns were to play varied. The interns
viewed themselves as experienced professionals who had been given the task of barrel distribution and retrieval. That this assignment could serve as a modeling experience for the educator role was inadequately communicated to the interns.

The following comments by the interns indicate their attitudes and feelings in their role:

The interns were seen as being "gofors". No one really told us what to do. The general attitude was that we were there to provide transportation—all they wanted were our gas and our cars.

Communication compounded a lot of the variables. We felt we had a lot of skills they were not tapping. One school told us they didn't want us going into homes. Parent communication is one of my skills—I'm competent. The people knew our skills, but it is the system that didn't allow for individual skills. The principals didn't take time to find out.

I collected barrels from eleven homes. It was a mess! The barrels were not complete. Some were missing instructions because the kids destroyed them. The teachers didn't reproduce the barrels adequately. Only a few parents were disgruntled—most were very pleased with what they received. I helped put the barrels together. I knew what they were about. I didn't model their use—just told parent what was in them. The form you gave me (see Appendix H) served as an outline to have something to talk about.

It made a good icebreaker. Parents didn't feel separated out, but felt good they could do something after the results of the screening was shared. They felt they could help get the child ready for school.

The intern participation should have been a lot different—maybe organized by area, because I was in classes. There was a real difference in commitment to the project from the two schools. One had more barrels because of the kindergarten teacher who took the most responsibility on the project.

I think the project was a success. However, I often had to leave barrels with a relative or neighbor, as people were not home when they said they would be. In the beginning I didn't keep accurate enough records as to which people got which barrels. We could have used more administrative support. A parent or community person could be at the school to check out the barrels.
You have to put up with unfriendly dogs and janitors. But, all things considered, I feel good about the project. If we can reach a few, or even one or two, we have been successful.

The program won't survive unless the community is involved. Many of these parents have a poor self-concept. Getting parents to commit even a small amount of time is difficult unless it relates to their own self-concept. The main focus of the program should be on the parent. Parents enthusiasm spurs on the interest of the child.

I didn't have time to demonstrate the use of the barrels, but this is the way to do it—get parents involved. Could have several children from a neighborhood doing barrels together in a home.

The interns seem to have a grasp of the project philosophically. These young persons (three males and one female) who served as project interns were dedicated learners. All had previous professional experience in education or social service. Having been previously in professional roles, the interns felt that the "leg work" or "goforing" in barrel distribution was not making adequate use of their skills.

Due to the time line of the project, communication as to assignments and responsibilities was often inadequate. The following statements by district and Teacher Corps personnel give another insight into the lack of adequate communication on job responsibility and role perception.

At first I thought the people used were not well-trained, but they had been doing home visits all along. Most are geared toward social work rather than being educators, so they have the basic skills for home contact. I think the problem was one of communication of program goals and expectations. They couldn't see the total project.

The above insight of an education coordinator stresses not only the need for better communication on the project, but also the need to be involved or at least to understand all phases of project
implementation. The need to have interpersonal skills and knowledge of educational tasks is important.

The District Title I Director states:

The problem with the project is the interns. Their accessibility is the key. We had the interns, and they went to the parents. They should have been involved in the barrel workshop. They are interns and when you are an intern you should have experience in many areas. I think they were just given a job, and they had to do it, and they did it. One of the interns did very well, but he did it--had more of an interest.

The District Teacher Corps Project Coordinator reports:

I was in charge of the intern assignment and having them get barrels out during the summer. I was not aware of the intern component being a weakness of the project.

A kindergarten teacher shares her awareness of the interns' confusion on job responsibility:

I had a couple of parents tell me no one came back to pick up the barrels. Parents didn't know enough about adapting the materials. Kids could help their parents learn, if we use them in the classroom. We need better instructions in the barrels for parents. The intern needed to be included in the initial meetings and in preparing the barrels. If they had known more, they might have had more of a personal interest rather than feeling it was just a job. It really was a pilot project, because now that it is almost ended, I can see how it all fits together.

"I can see how it all fit together!" If this kindergarten teacher had been able to put the pieces together, perhaps the project did follow a logical pattern of sequential development. The insight shown here certainly could give district personnel some insight into program development from pilot phase to concrete implementation.

The education coordinator summed up the interns' participation as follows:

It has been a concern of mine that the interns missed the creativity—like a teacher sees so many opportunities to step in there and do more. I didn't find that (with the interns). If I said, "walk over there" and "lay that book down", they'd do it
real well, but if I said, "go over there and help a kid" (she just shakes her head). One was going to help me organize kindergarten registration, and there was no help there. Another cancelled out on the very day of the project. You can't let parents down. You have to create a very positive feeling at the beginning. They (the interns) really have let us down. A thousand times in a row I felt they were very judgmental of the teachers. I felt they were too hard-nosed. You have to be practical and the interns were heavily philosophical. They spent the half hour being a friend, which every kid needs, but when the half hour ended, you didn't see anything--idealistic rather than practical. The interns were the one element on the project floating between all of us, and there was a lack of communication.

The final responsibility for the project was vested in the Teacher Corps Director. As mentioned earlier there were two directors during the barrel intervention project. When each was interviewed concerning insight into the concerns centering around intern perception and participation, the director with the project through the spring screening and summer intervention reflected:

I think the interns were cognitively aware of how this program fits into the whole scheme of things. I think the interns themselves did not perceive the project as important—low priority with them for the summer, and therefore, they did not take the opportunity to participate as they could have. It was a wonderful opportunity for them to use those social service skills they had developed, but I feel it was basically a lack of intern interest and initiative. I think it was a shame, but............

The director who came on the program the fall following the intervention project and who was now responsible for the evaluation aspect, shared a lack of knowledge or insight into this particular problem:

I had no knowledge of this problem until after the summer, and then from teachers sharing. I have no direct information on this.

Although the perspective on the interns' participation varied, all participants acknowledged a need for change in this aspect of the project. As it turned out, this was the final year for interns to be
used in the program. So alternative ways of communicating with parents and using readiness materials need to be explored.

**Institutional Change: A New Course Option**

A basic dilemma that must be faced is the question of control. Gordon (1970) believes that educators see curriculum, teaching methods, and school organization as their professional realm, and that parents and those outside the education profession feel that they have much to say and to contribute and should, therefore be involved in decision making. Both the so-called disadvantaged home and the school must somehow be changed through the combined efforts of school personnel and parents. Many involvement programs seek to change the home and leave the school inviolate. Many parents are now demanding that the school change to become more what parents want. Institutions have long had a history of spending their energies in preserving the status quo. Sometimes this has led to the destruction of the institution as the only means available for change. It would be indeed unfortunate if this were our only solution.

The institution, in this case the university, was impacted by the project. It responded with a new course option for the pre-service education of teachers. The students who selected to add a field experience component to their Kindergarten Methods Course shared the following:

The testing went very smoothly as far as working with the children. They seemed to enjoy the special attention and did quite well.

A frustrating experience for me, as you already know, was the fact that I could not devote more time to the assessment and to the good and valuable learning experience that it provided. I just felt really frustrated because we didn't know about some of
the problems that we were going to encounter ahead of time. The whole assessment, perhaps, could have been narrowed down to several similar days like last spring. The whole assessment was a rewarding experience. The children were just great. A factor for the whole assessment project was to word your questions appropriately, and I felt confident with this aspect. By relaxing with each child the whole experience was made more fun. For me it is the best reward just to see a child smile and be really into their experience. I still feel that the experience is very worthwhile, and that I would recommend it highly.

The school backed us completely and treated us as professionals.

I thought the program booklet was very self-explicit and easy to follow. The reception from the school was wonderful, so there are no suggestions.

Thanks so much for giving me the opportunity to work with the kindergarten assessment. It was a great learning experience.

The above statements were the type that were shared by all pre-service teachers participating in the screening process. Two of the students who participated in the spring screening also chose to participate in the fall screening. The spring screening ran smoother as children came in with their parents at scheduled times, and gym and learning resource centers provided specifically prepared environments for the process. For the fall screening children were removed from the classroom whenever possible for assessment. This was often disruptive for the kindergarten teacher as well as the children.

When the Teacher Corps Directors were questioned about continuing this field component as a part of the Kindergarten Methods Course, they replied:

It would be an excellent additional component to this course. With the government's concern with early diagnosis for instance through PL 94-142, kindergarten teachers need this type of short-term exposure to accountability issues in teaching and assessment.

It is the only example I am aware of where the Teacher Corps project has had any impact or direct change on the university. I think it is important to put permanency to it.
CHAPTER VI
EVALUATION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In an attempt to evaluate the impact of the early screening and early intervention process and to use the information gained as the basis for recommended changes, this researcher offers the following summary and conclusions. The purpose of this study was to provide a comprehensive description and documentation of process related to (1) conceptual issues, (2) design issues, (3) implementation issues, and (4) evaluation issues of an early screening and intervention project for prekindergarten children.

The comprehensive description and documentation of process related to the conceptualization, development, implementation and evaluation of the project seems to indicate that the project was philosophically sound. The project developed out of a response to needs, as stated by the Teacher Corps Director who worked with the project at its inception:

The project stemmed from a needs assessment which was conducted by the school, community, and the university. The barrel project originated with the community and the teachers. The community felt they wanted to be more directly involved with the education of their children. They wanted to do something for their children before school started, but they didn't know what. At this time the school's primary teachers felt that the children were not prepared—they wanted beginning types of skills for children to get a head start before entering school. If kids could come to school with some basic skills then the curriculum would be easier to implement. They felt there was a wide range of skills and abilities between children, and they wondered
what could be done to narrow this range. The community came up with the idea of some type of intervention program. The district, after the program was in motion from the community, felt the advantage might be to develop a positive attitude in the community toward the schools.

**Organization and Communication**

All levels of participants had indicated their continuing interest and support of the program. The modifications which need to be made seem to center around two issues: organization and communication. This finding is supportive of the statement made by Lightfoot (1981, p. 100) that "education for the majority of children will only be successful when there is trust, accountability, and responsibility shared between families, communities, and schools."

The following model depicts the interactive relationships between participants or representatives of institutions involved in the project. A hierarchy of organization and communication is established within the school district. Interaction begins at any level but flows through the resources as diagramed. Input from community agents and the university is usually through the education coordinators or the principals. The education coordinators and the principals serve as the "hub" of information dissemination. These individuals are the key to the success of program development. As Lightfoot (1981) has pointed out, trust, accountability, and responsibility must be shared by all participants. An awareness and commitment to program development by the district, the community, and the university is essential. This model is supported by the resources made available through the school district's association with the university and through the services within the community. The
resources at the university include the faculty of the College of Education, as well as the pre-service teachers (students) preparing to enter the field of education. The request for an intervention program from district personnel, the community, and parents was directed to the university. After the four year Teacher Corps Project is
completed, the university remains as a viable resource. It is hoped that the communication which has been established through the project will continue. The university can make the commitment to continue course credit to pre-service teachers through field components in courses. Pre-service teachers can gain knowledge through practice by serving as assessors, parent educators and home visitors. Faculty and students can serve the district not only as program consultants, but also in field training and modeling of skills in the classrooms and in the homes.

Design Issues

Community services, including Head Start and other preschool programs such as the YMCA, health services, and the public library, can serve as resources in preparing the child for school entrance. Preschool programs can keep lines of communication open with the local school district concerning individual children and their families, so that early diagnosis of problems and prescription for remediation can begin prior to entering school. The public library can serve as a dissemination point for learning materials. Many of the parents interviewed said they would check-out learning materials from the public library if they were made available. This dissemination of materials prior to school entrance is supportive of Bausell's (1979) concern that the explanation for social class differences in achievement is that the experiences of children from high socioeconomic status homes are far more like the educational experiences in school than those of children from lower socioeconomic backgrounds. The essential role of parents in the education of their children must
be recognized and steps must be taken to encourage parental teaching at all socioeconomic levels.

The parents were the most enthusiastic participants in the intervention process. Although they were aware of and often frustrated by the missing materials in the barrels, a lack of instructions or modeling by interns, and their own feelings of inadequacy, they still were excited about this prekindergarten contact from school to home. They were impressed that the school reached out to help the child prepare for kindergarten in a concrete way (the barrels). Parents made the suggestions that: (1) the public library be used to disseminate learning materials, (2) neighborhood groups be formed for sharing and reinforcing skill development among the parents, (3) unemployed fathers be trained and encouraged to be in the classroom to teach the children skills, (4) a series of workshops be conducted for parents, working alongside educators, to make learning materials. The prevailing message was: "We want more of this!" The necessary modifications include better organization of materials and dissemination of the materials. Parents have stated their willingness to construct, organize, disseminate, and model the use of learning materials with other parents. They need the support of trained educators in organizing a program and communicating this program from the school to the home. This is in agreement with the research of Bloom, Davis, and Hess (1965) which concluded that the home should be the place for compensatory education. Fusco (1966) also concluded that the school must take the initiative.
Implementation Issues

Three of the four kindergarten teachers involved expressed their willingness to commit time and energy to the continuation of a learning task program involving materials going from the school into the homes. The two schools not participating in the summer intervention project are now exploring the use of the barrels, since the kindergarten teachers at these schools have also expressed their interest in becoming a part of such a program. The kindergarten teachers and their aides are anxious to continue the prekindergarten contact with the home through a screening process each spring that will include the Santa Clara Inventory of Developmental Tasks, a Kindergarten Handbook, and visits to the classrooms. All of the teachers in the intervention process intend to continue either visits or phone calls to each family prior to fall kindergarten entrance. This early contact from the school to the home is supportive of the research by Hess (1976) which found home visits to be especially effective in changing parental attitudes and producing significant and stable I.Q. gains in children.

All of these teachers would welcome parents into their classrooms, if workshops or training sessions were conducted to give specific information on working with children on specific tasks. These workshops could be conducted by the teachers or the education coordinators.

Parents being included in the classroom as paraprofessionals has produced student achievement gains as documented by Weibly (1979). It seems that programs designed to train low-income parents in tutoring techniques have been the most successful in improving...
achievement in elementary school students. Changing the parents' attitudes toward the school and their child's academic potential, as well as the parents' own feelings of competence in the role of teacher, may be an important first step to improving student achievement. Task cards which contain sequentially numbered games and activities are a part of the prescriptive plan added to the Santa Clara Inventory (the Santa Clara Plus recipe cards). Some teachers have suggested modifying the barrels into portfolios of games and tasks which could easily be carried home by the children. Teachers and parents could be working simultaneously with a child on task development. This involvement would support the findings of Bronfenbrenner (1974) that the most critical element in early education programs is the direct involvement of a mother or a mother figure in the developmental activities of the child. Parents choosing to participate in the classroom would already be familiar with a task card approach and would be able to work with a child one-on-one or in a small group on prescriptive materials. Teachers often said that parent participation in the classroom takes too much direction. This concern of teachers might well be based on the protectiveness of teachers as expressed by Thomas (1980, p. 203) when he stated that "teachers tend to hold parents at bay through aloofness, rigid bureaucratic practices, and claims of territorial rights and professionalism." Again, parents want to help the child, if they are given the necessary skills.

An on-going intervention program will probably be a key responsibility of the building education coordinator. This role is,
by its position of accessibility to teacher, principal and parent, the most logical one to buffer organization and communication. During the school year, the education coordinator could serve as the key person in tracking barrel or portfolio placement. She could organize workshops for parents and teachers to construct materials and replenish the barrels or portfolios. During the summer this person could be employed part-time by the district to disseminate and model the use of materials in individual homes, in neighborhood groups, or with volunteer parents who had expressed a willingness to share materials and skills with other parents. This appears to be the key person in the success of the program.

The principal at one of the schools expressed her interest and on-going support of the prekindergarten skill intervention process. The principal serves as the link between the individual school and the district office. The awareness and commitment of this individual to the program is key to program implementation and success. The education coordinators and the principals see the intervention process as becoming a part of the Disadvantaged Pupil Program which is administered out of the district office.

The District Title I Director, who was previously the principal at one school, was very aware of the potential of the intervention process and had expressed a commitment to it continuance. She felt program continuance was based on the continued awareness, communication, and commitment of the district, the community, and the university.
Evaluation of Feasibility

A program can be continued and developed because of a decision made at the final level of an organization and communication model—in this case the district office. Perhaps the most accepted and successful programs developed because of an awareness and commitment which grew from within the organizational structure. As the education coordinator at one school commented:

This program may swing because of the Disadvantaged Pupil Program and involvement with Title I. It will enter by the back door through another program. Beginning in January (1981), program meetings are being held to explain to principals and staff the implementation of such programs, with the use of charts and video tapes. I think this is the most saleable of the programs because it is a complete program. It is based on research. It has credibility. It extends into the home. There is a big push towards communication with the community, so I think they may buy into it. This program has the interest and support of the university. The program is very complete. It addresses the needs of students, parents, and teachers. Maybe none of the other programs addresses all three facets.

This coordinator sees the principal as the key person in electing to use the program in the school. She felt that a highly concerned and motivated principal would take the time to review the program. She was aware that two of the four elementary principals in the district were interested in the program's continuation and hoped the "ripple effect" would occur. She felt that as it was used in these buildings, others would hear of its success and seek information on implementing the program in their school. Again, she supported the growth of the project internally rather than its being mandated from the district office.

The principal at one school was approached by the other principals following a meeting of the Administrative Council. They
expressed a desire for more information on the use of the Santa Clara Inventory. One principal followed this initial contact with a phone call to get information. The "ripple effect" seemed to be underway.

The current Teacher Corps Director summed up the impact and potential for district implementation of the project in the following statement:

I would agree that the barrel project was one of the most successful endeavors of the Teacher Corps Project. As far as district implementation or adaptation, I think it has real possibilities. In writing this evaluation report, it is one of the two projects showing the most potential. Implementation has to come from the school district based on their needs. I think one of the keys to any of these program elements is the quicker or more readily it becomes detached from Teacher Corps, the better. There are persons within Teacher Corps that tend to be protective. I think the best implementers are outside of the program. I think it is important to make people aware—not to push. Its (the intervention project) potential comes out of its concreteness for implementation.

A basic dilemma that must be faced is the question of control. Gordon (1970) believes that educators see curriculum, teaching methods, and school organization as their professional realm, and that parents and those outside the education profession feel that they have much to say to contribute and should, therefore, be involved in decision making. Both the so-called disadvantaged home and the school must somehow be changed through the combined efforts of school personnel and parents. Many involvement programs seek to change the home and leave the school inviolate. Many parents are now demanding that the school change to become more what parents want. Institutions have had a long history of spending their energies in preserving the status quo. Sometimes this has led to the destruction of the institution as the only means available for change. It would be indeed unfortunate
if this were our only solution. If we do not wish the home or the
school destroyed, we must somehow find vehicles for communication and
cooperation by which both institutions are modified without going
through the destruction phase. Parental involvement means involvement
of parents in partnership with the teacher. The needs, strengths,
concerns, and special knowledge of the parent must be meshed with the
expertise of the professional.

Recommendations

The following recommendations serve as a summation of the
above evaluation based on the description and documentation process:

1. There needs to be consistency in assessment materials
used. The same instrument should be used for both the spring
prekindergarten screening and the fall kindergarten screening.

2. There needs to be coordination and communication of values
and expectations of the community preschool programs with the district
kindergarten program personnel.

3. There needs to be uniform information given to parents
prior to kindergarten admission concerning their children's skill
development as related to school readiness.

4. There needs to be a first positive communication from the
kindergarten teacher to the parent via phone call or home visit prior
to fall kindergarten admission.

5. There needs to be a spring prekindergarten time for
registration, screening, and classroom visitation for all children and
their caregiver.

6. There needs to be an interviewing type analysis of each
child and his family's personal and social needs prior to school
entrance.

7. There need to be on-going meetings throughout the school
year to share concerns and intervention assessment by district
personnel, parents, community early childhood persons, and
representatives from the university.
8. There needs to be a sharing conference, held following the spring and fall screenings, between parents and teachers on the profile results on the children's assessments.

9. There needs to be a continuation of a field-based option for university courses for pre-service teachers.

10. There needs to be training of parents as home educators and classroom aides via workshops held at the school.

11. There needs to be training and encouragement of father's participating as prime educators of the child.

12. There needs to be a plan for kindergarten teachers sharing assessment profiles on each child with the first grade teachers prior to the fall following promotion from kindergarten.

13. There needs to be a parent participation evaluation form developed so that parents can evaluate their own involvement, as well as their child's involvement, in the skill development program.

**Reflections**

In reflecting back on the experience of working with the participants in the screening and intervention process, I find myself focusing on the content of the information shared through the interviews. The insights, feelings, and attitudes of the parents involved in the process have served as the content foundation for two courses I have taught at a university this past year. Two years have passed since my total involvement in the process described in this document. The material is a rich source of current information on today's parents and their relationships to the school system.

My comprehension of the literature in home/school relations served as a theoretical foundation for the documentation of the applied practice of this theory through the screening and intervention project. An undergraduate course, Home School Relations in Early Childhood Education, and a graduate course, Parent-Teacher-Child
Relations, served as an opportunity to share both theory and practice with both pre-service and in-service teachers. A home visit component was added to both of these courses. Undergraduate and graduate students (1) observed a specific child, (2) observed the parent-teacher conference concerning the child, and (3) visited the child's home. The parent interview focused on the parental dreams and ambitions for the child. This was an opportunity for the student and the parent to explore the linkage of dreams to the concrete experiences encountered by the child in the here and now classroom experience. What can happen today to lead to the realization of those dreams for tomorrow?

The families participating in the screening and intervention project were mainly lower middle and middle income suburban white families. The families that my students interviewed for their courses were lower and middle income urban black as well as white families. However, in both populations it was apparent that (1) parents do care about their children, and (2) parenting skills must be taught. Parenting skills can be taught through exposure or modeling, by using materials, or by communicating or sharing ideas and techniques.

Pre-service teachers need a variety of field based experiences. They need to "try on the roles" of assessors of skills (through screening instruments), active listeners of parents (through home visiting), and trainers of parents (through workshops). In-service teachers need continued support and training in working with parents in homes and in their classrooms.
Someway we must link children to their potential through their families. We must discover the dreams of parents for the child. We must turn dreams of potential into the "working stuff" of task achievement at the child's present stage of development, so that we begin to build in reality today, the dreams of tomorrow.
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APPENDIX A

SEVEN STEPS TO INTERVENTION
**Pre-existing Condition:** Project Commitment to increasing communication and parent involvement with target school’s staff and promoting awareness of and response to identified community needs.

### Step 1 Autumn '79
**Identification of Need**
1. District - K Teachers
2. Building Principals
3. Parents
4. Pre-school - Head Start, YWCA
5. Teacher Corps Staff

### Step 2
**Commitment to Early Assessment Project**
1. District
2. Teacher Corps Staff
3. Inclusion of Parents to foster community school communication

### Step 3 Winter '80
**Research Analysis of Existing Assessment Tools**
1. Teacher Corps Staff (University)
2. Santa Clara Inventory

### Step 4 Spring '80
**Assessment Process/Screening**
1. Administration of selecting subjects. (T.C. Staff/pre-service Teachers)
2. Development of Learning Barrels (District Personnel)
3. Readiness Handbook

### Step 5 Summer '80
**Performance Phase/Intervention**
1. Learning Barrel Distribution & Retrieval (3 Barrels per subject; each barrel focused on major assessed needs)
   - Teacher Corps Staff (Interns)

### Step 6 Autumn '80
**Fall Screening**
1. Subjects new in K
2. Non-selected now in K
3. New students in K
   - Teacher Corps Staff
   - District Personnel - K Teachers
   - Pre-service Teachers

### Step 7 Autumn '80
**Conference/Interviewing & Program Evaluation**
1. Teachers Corps Staff
2. District K-Teachers
3. Interview - Parental Attitudes Key Focus
REGISTRATION FORM
(Confidential)

In order to keep an accurate record, certain information is required regarding your child. We are asking for your cooperation in completing the following form.

PUPIL'S NAME:  (Last) (First) (Middle) SEX: Male Female

BIRTHDATE: (Month) (Day) (Year) BIRTHPLACE: (City) (State)

ADDRESS: (House #) (Street) (Apt. or) (City) (State) (Zip) Lot No.

PREVIOUS SCHOOL EXPERIENCE

Has child had a full year of kindergarten experience? Yes ______ No ______

Last school attended: (School) (City) (State) (Zip) (Grade)

Has child ever attended a South-Western School? Yes ______ No ______ If yes,

When ______ Which South-Western School ______

Are there any special academic or health concerns that we should be aware of? Yes ______ No ______ If YES ________

EMPLOYMENT

Name Where Employed Bus. Phone No.

Father: ____________________________ __________________________

Mother: ____________________________ (If housewife, indicate)

Guardian: ____________________________ 

Federally Employed? Father: Yes ______ No ______ Mother: Yes ______ No ______

Are Parents: Divorced ______ Mother deceased ______ Separated ______ Father deceased ______ Step Parent ______

IN CASE OF EMERGENCY, PLEASE NOTIFY

Attempts are made to contact parents first, so please do not repeat above information. Relatives and/or neighbors (give relationship to child) and phone number:

Name Relationship Phone No.

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

Physicians's Name Phone No. Parent's Signature
REGISTER OF ALL CHILDREN IN YOUR FAMILY

List children below who are 17 years of age or younger. List oldest child first.

1. ______________________________________________________________________________________
2. ______________________________________________________________________________________
3. ______________________________________________________________________________________
4. ______________________________________________________________________________________
5. ______________________________________________________________________________________
6. ______________________________________________________________________________________

A child must be 5 years of age on or before September 30 of the year they enter kindergarten.
A child must be 6 years of age on or before September 30 of the year they enter first grade.
IN BOTH CASES, A BIRTH CERTIFICATE MUST BE PRESENTED TO VERIFY AGE.

FOR KINDERGARTEN USE ONLY

Kindergarten Assignment

I know that transportation is a factor in assignment to morning or afternoon sessions. If possible, I would like for my child to attend

________________________ Morning Session  ________________ Afternoon Session

FOR SCHOOL USE ONLY

Birth Date Verified Form: _______ Birth Certificate

_________ Baptismal Certificate

_________ Other (Give source)

New School __________________________________________
Date of Entry __________________________________________
Grade _________________________________________________

________________________________________________________
Signature of Registrar

Rev: 2/79
rf
APPENDIX C

THE C.O.S. CHECKLIST
THE C.O.S. CHECKLIST

Name __________________________
Date __________________________
Birthdate ______________________
School _________________________

Total Score __________

1. Information
   a. What is your name? __________________________ (2)
      First name (1) First and last (2)
   b. How old are you? __________________________ (1)
   c. On what street do you live? __________________________ (1) (4)

2. Vocabulary
   a. What is a hat? __________________________ (2)
   b. What is a ball? __________________________ (2)
   c. What is a stove? __________________________ (2)
   d. What is an orange? __________________________ (2)
   e. What is a letter? __________________________ (2) (10)

3. Auditory memory
   Say: I am going to say some words. Listen carefully because when I'm finished want you to say them back to me.
   a. He is a big boy. __________________________ (1)
   b. Jack likes to feed little puppies in the barn. __________________________ (1)

   Say: I am going to say some numbers. Listen carefully because when I'm finished want you to say them back to me.
   a. 6-4-1 __________________________ (1)
   b. 9-8-6-1 __________________________ (1) (4)

4. Fine motor
   a. Cut a piece of paper on a line. __________________________ (1)
      (Right hand ) (Left hand )
   b. Holds scissors correctly __________________________ (1) (2)
   c. Copy shapes
      1. Circle __________________________ (1)
      2. Cross __________________________ (1)
      3. Square __________________________ (1)
      4. Triangle __________________________ (1)
      5. Diamond __________________________ (1) (5)
   d. Holds pencil correctly __________________________ (1) (1)
      (Right hand ) (Left hand )
   e. Recall
      Say: See how many of the shapes we just saw can you remember and draw again.
      1. Circle __________________________ (1)
      2. Cross __________________________ (1)
      3. Square __________________________ (1)
      4. Triangle __________________________ (1)
      5. Diamond __________________________ (1) (5)
   f. Draw a person
      1. Head __________________________ (1)
      2. Body __________________________ (1)
      3. Eyes & mouth __________________________ (1)
      4. Arms and legs __________________________ (1) (4)
   g. Write name ______________________________________________________________________ (1) (3)
      First (1) Last (1) Uses lower case letters (1)

5. Directions
   a. Draw a line at the bottom of your paper __________________________ (1)
   b. Draw a circle at the left side of your paper __________________________ (1)
   c. Draw an X at the top of your paper __________________________ (1) (3)
6. Gross motor
   a. Hop on one foot (5 seconds) ______________________ (2)
      Right foot (1)       Left foot (1)
   b. Skip ________________________________ (1)
   c. Bounce ball 6 times ________________________ (1)
   d. Walk balance board ________________________ (1) (5)

7. Following directions
   a. Put this pencil above your head, then behind you, then
gen it to me. ________________________________ (2)
   b. Take two steps forward and one step backwards ________________ (2)
   c. Clap loudly. __________ Clap softly. ________________ (1) (5)

8. Counting
   Counting 10 blocks ________________________________ (5)

9. Identify numbers 1-10, 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 (10)

10. Identify colors ________________________________ (10)
    red    green    blue    yellow    black
    brown  orange  white  purple  pink

11. Identify shapes ________________________________ (6)
    circle    square    triangle    rectangle
    diamond    ellipse

12. Identify letters
   a. Capital letters (list the letters the child knows in each set.)
      1-3 ________________________________ (1)
      4-6 ________________________________ (1)
      7-9 ________________________________ (1)
      10-12 ________________________________ (1)
      13-15 ________________________________ (1)
      16-18 ________________________________ (1)
      19-21 ________________________________ (1)
      22-24 ________________________________ (1)
      25-26 ________________________________ (1) (9)
   b. Lower case letters (list the letters the child knows in each set.)
      1-3 ________________________________ (1)
      4-6 ________________________________ (1)
      7-9 ________________________________ (1)
      10-12 ________________________________ (1)
      13-15 ________________________________ (1)
      16-18 ________________________________ (1)
      19-21 ________________________________ (1)
      22-24 ________________________________ (1)
      25-26 ________________________________ (1) (9)
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DEVELOPMENTAL PROFILE
**DEVELOPMENTAL PROFILE**

Santa Clara Inventory of Developmental Tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Birthdate</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Testing Dates:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C.D.</th>
<th>L.D.</th>
<th>A.M.</th>
<th>A.P.</th>
<th>V.M.</th>
<th>V.P.</th>
<th>V.M.P.</th>
<th>M.C.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Scoring:**

- **0** - Almost never
- **1** - Some of the time
- **2** - Most of the time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0  1  2</td>
<td>0  1  2</td>
<td>0  1  2</td>
<td>0  1  2</td>
<td>0  1  2</td>
<td>0  1  2</td>
<td>0  1  2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3  6</td>
<td>6  7</td>
<td>6  7</td>
<td>6  7</td>
<td>6  7</td>
<td>6  7</td>
<td>6  7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7  9</td>
<td>7  10</td>
<td>7  10</td>
<td>7  11</td>
<td>7  11</td>
<td>7  11</td>
<td>7  11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8  11</td>
<td>8  11</td>
<td>8  11</td>
<td>8  11</td>
<td>8  11</td>
<td>8  11</td>
<td>8  11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PRE-SCHOOL**

- 5 - 5 1/2 YRS.
- 6 - 6 1/2 YRS.
- 7 YRS.
APPENDIX E

KINDERGARTEN ASSESSMENT
KINDERGARTEN ASSESSMENT

An Optional (2 unit) Field-Based Experience for EMCE #501 Students (Au, Sp, Su Qtrs.)

In order to provide a field-based experience for students enrolled in Ed-E&MC #501 - Kindergarten and PreSchool teaching, the following course option would be available: Kindergarten Assessment (2 units). Undergraduate students preparing for teaching in kindergarten and preschool need an opportunity to relate to children, teachers, parents and administrators during their preparatory, preservice phase. The City School District conjointly with the Ohio State University through the Teacher Corps Project can provide this opportunity through their Kindergarten Assessment Program.

Assessment Process

The City School District and the Ohio State University through the Teacher Corps Project conjointly participate in the developmental screening of kindergarten children in the spring prior to kindergarten admission. Spring quarter students registered in ED-E&MC #501 would be trained to give the assessment instrument. Approximately 20 hrs. would be required for training and actual assessment as follows:

Assessment Training Session I 2 hrs.
Reading manual and preparing materials 2 hrs.
Assessment Training Session II 2 hrs.
Assessment of Pre-school children entering kindergarten in the fall
Day 1 6 hrs.
Day 2 6 hrs.
The instrument is administered again during the fall quarter to up-date developmental progress of each child as well as to document a summer intervention program. ED-E&MC #501 students registered for autumn quarter would also have the option of participating in the program as outlined for spring quarter with all assessment taking place in the kindergarten classroom with children registered in the District rather than prekindergarten assessment.

**Intervention Program**

During the summer Teacher Corps links the spring developmental assessment to the fall kindergarten curriculum through a parent/child learning activities program. "Learning Barrels" assembled by kindergarten teachers and aides are used in the home to reinforce sequential, developmental learning tasks identified by the assessment instrument. This is an opportunity for #501 students to work with parents and children screened for kindergarten in the spring in preparation for fall entry into the school district. Participation is outlined as follows:

- **Parent Involvement Training Session**: 2 hrs.
- **Survey of “learning activities”**: 2 hrs.
- **Participation with parents/children**: 10 hrs.
- **Parent Involvement Training Session II**: 2 hrs.
- **Designing learning materials**: 2 hrs.
- **Evaluation Session III**: 2 hrs.

The two unit course in conjunction with ED-E&MC #501 provides the student with the opportunity to put 1) theory into practice, 2) to make direct contact with students, parents, teachers, and
administrators, and 3) to evaluate instruments and materials supporting sequential learning tasks.

Resources


Santa Clara Developmental Inventory.
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TIME LINE FOR PRESCHOOL ASSESSMENT
### TIME LINE FOR PRESCHOOL ASSESSMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tasks</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Personnel</th>
<th>Placement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Administer</td>
<td>30 min.</td>
<td>(a) OSU Students (5)</td>
<td>Multi-purpose room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa-Clara</td>
<td></td>
<td>(b) Interns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Eye Screening</td>
<td>5-10 min.</td>
<td>Nurse - Title I aide</td>
<td>Title I Reading Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Hearing Screening</td>
<td>5-10 min.</td>
<td>Speech Therapist</td>
<td>Staff-Development Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Play Area</td>
<td>30 min.</td>
<td>ERC Aide</td>
<td>Disadvantaged Pupil Program Room (DPP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Completion of Registration Forms</td>
<td>30 min.</td>
<td>Principal, Aide</td>
<td>Educational Resource Center (E.R.C.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Orientation to School</td>
<td>30 min.</td>
<td>Educational Coordinator.</td>
<td>E.R.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Scheduling for Post-Assessment Conference</td>
<td>5-10 min.</td>
<td>Education Coordinator</td>
<td>E.R.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten Teacher Release</td>
<td>15 min.</td>
<td>Title I Teacher</td>
<td>Kindergarten Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>every hr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optional Tour</td>
<td>15 min.</td>
<td>Education Coordinator</td>
<td>School Facility</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX G

PARENT INTERVIEW FORM FOR LEARNING BARREL PROJECT
Your participation in working with your child with the learning barrels this past summer was appreciated. Please answer the following questions so that we can evaluate the success of the project.

Name of Child ____________________________ Birthdate __________________

Persons in Home (ie: parents, grandparents, brothers, sisters, etc.)

_________________________________________ age__________
_________________________________________ age__________
_________________________________________ age__________
_________________________________________ age__________

Barrels Used (ie: Letters, Numbers, etc.)

1. __________________________________________________
2. __________________________________________________
3. __________________________________________________

The Materials:

How was the use of the materials explained?

Did you understand how to use the games?

Were enough materials supplied?

The Visitor:

Did you expect the visit? How were you contacted? Time convenient?

How much did he/she spend with you on each visit? Was the use of a new barrel explained satisfactorily?

Time Spent with your Child:

How often was a barrel used? For how long? Did your child use barrel alone, with another child, with you? Did child ask to use the barrel? Did you set a special time to use the barrel?
Parent Form (Continued)

Rate your satisfaction with barrel project: (1 is excellent down to 5 is failure)
1 2 3 4 5

Would you like to participate in your child's classroom? Yes_ No_

Communication with the School:

Did the program help you to feel like you knew more about the school your child will attend? Yes_ No_

Did you get to meet and talk with the kindergarten teacher before the ten week barrel program? Yes_ No_

Do you feel the school cares about your child? Yes_ No_

Who at the school would you call for help or information?

How can the school best share your child's progress and interests with you?

Would you or can you participate as a parent in your child's classroom? Helping other parents learn to use the barrels?

Understanding Your Child:

Did the use of the barrels help you to better understand how your child learns or what your child can and cannot do? Explain?

How can the school continue to help you as the most important person in your child's life? Suggestions?
APPENDIX H

UNIVERSITY/CITY SCHOOLS TEACHER CORPS PROJECT
University/City Schools
Teacher Corps Project

LEARNING BARRELS

Child's Name______________________________________________

Learning Barrel Used_______________________________________

Date Distributed _______ Date Picked Up _______________

Number of times barrel used_______ How long each time?__________

Did your child enjoy this activity?

Did you enjoy doing this activity with your child?

Was it clear how to use this barrel?

Were there any problems?

Any suggestions as to how this project can be more helpful to you or to your child?

Would you enjoy participating in your child's classroom this year?
APPENDIX I

ASSESSMENT FORM FOR TEACHER CORPS INTERNS
ASSESSMENT FORM
FOR
TEACHER CORPS INTERNS

Please respond as directly and candidly as you can to the following questions. Your answers will serve as a basis for analyzing the success of the ten week learning barrel project in the City School District.

Name ____________________________________ Phone _____________________

School Assignment _________________________

Dates on Project _______________ thru _______________

# of homes contacted _______ average # of barrels per home _______

What was the best method to arrange a visit? phone _______

mail _______

at each visit _______

other _______

Were parents usually home when visit was scheduled? Yes_______ No _______

Comments:

Were you received enthusiastically _______

hesitantly _______

with reserve _______

Comments:

Did you explain the use of the new barrel?

Comments:

Did parents seem to understand the learning tasks?

Comments:

Did you demonstrate the use of materials?

Comments:

Did you do any learning tasks with the child?

Comments:
Intern Form

Give examples of the most frequent concerns of parents:

What questions were most frequently asked?

Please rate the following on a scale of one to five: (one = excellent, five = very poor)

1. I felt the overall project was rewarding for parents ______
2. I felt adequately trained and informed to visit homes ______
3. I understood the goals of the project ______
4. I enjoyed working with the families ______
5. I think the children benefited from the barrels ______
6. I felt the overall experience was rewarding for me ______

Comment in detail on any aspects of the project where you would suggest change. Comment on both strengths and weaknesses:
APPENDIX J

INTERVIEW FORM FOR KINDERGARTEN TEACHERS
INTERVIEW FORM
for
KINDERGARTEN TEACHERS

Child's Name______________________________
Contact with Parents ________________________________
Parent Initiated Contact ________________________________
Describe:

Teacher Initiated Contact ________________________________
Describe:

Were you aware that this child/parent were in a summer intervention program? How?

Now that you are aware that the child/parent were participants, do you see any special strengths or weaknesses in the skill areas worked on by parent and child during the summer?

Comments and suggestions concerning the intervention program:

Has the program made you aware earlier of specific children, their special needs, their families, this community and its needs?
APPENDIX K

ASSESSMENT FORM FOR DISTRICT PERSONNEL
The City School District and The University Teacher Corps Project were involved in a ten week intervention program. "Learning Barrels" were placed in homes of prekindergarteners preparing to attend the district. Parents served as the prime educators in helping their children with developmental tasks. Please answer the following in order to give your perspective on the intervention program:

Were you aware of the project? Yes ____ No ____

If so, how?

Did you take part in the initial meetings to design the project?

Yes ____ No ____

To what extent?

How would or will you use the information gained to help in your understanding of each child, family, home situation, or the community in general? Please comment:

How do you intend to use the spring and fall profiles on the children screened? Please comment:

Please rate your overall support of the implementation of such a project as an on-going contact with parents in your district:

Excellent____ Very Possible with a few modifications____

Needs Major Changes____ Not Feasible____
APPENDIX L

SUMMARY OF ORAL PRESENTATION TO SUBJECTS
SUMMARY OF ORAL PRESENTATION
TO SUBJECTS

The screening in which your child took part two weeks ago at the elementary school has given us this picture (profile) of the skills your child has accomplished in the seven areas on this sheet. Let's look at each area and see just how far he/she has come since birth. With your help over the next ten weeks prior to entering kindergarten and through the use of the learning barrels made by our kindergarten teachers and aides, your child could master even more of the skills necessary for doing well in kindergarten. Let's look at the areas in which he/she could use some special help. Are there three areas that you and your child might work on together over the next ten weeks? Even 10 minutes every day would be a special time for the two of you to play the games and learn together. If you would like to work with your child, the two of you could take a barrel home today (barrels are decorated attractively and contain intriguing games and instructions for use). An intern student working with us from the Teacher Corps will arrange to pick the barrel up from your home in a couple of weeks and leave off a second barrel for your use.
APPENDIX M

PARENTAL CONSENT FORM FOR LEARNING BARREL PROJECT
PARENTAL CONSENT FORM

FOR

LEARNING BARREL PROJECT

As the parent of ____________________________ I was invited to take part in the School District/University Teacher Corp Project intervention program. I volunteered to work with my child using a series of "learning barrels". The results of both spring screening and fall screening developmental profiles on my child have been shared with me by the Kindergarten teacher and/or a representative from The Teacher Corps Project.

__________________________
(signature)

__________________________
(date)
APPENDIX N

LETTER TO PARENTS
November 30, 1980

Dear

Thank you for sharing your time and thoughts on the learning barrel project. Most of the twenty plus parents interviewed agreed that the use of the learning barrels with their child was a worthwhile experience. Hopefully, you will be able to see the results of your time spent with your child over the summer in this project as he/she continues to gain new skills in kindergarten.

The barrels continue to be available for your use through the kindergarten teacher. Please send a note with your child to school if you wish to receive additional barrels during the school year.

The enclosed consent form is required by The Ohio State University for me to be able to write up the results of the interviews with the parents in the barrel project. Your name will not be used in any form. What I wish to write up and share are your ideas and recommendations for change.

Please sign your child's name on the "participant" line and your name on the line immediately below "Person Authorized to Consent for Participant - If Required" and return to me in the enclosed postage paid envelope.

Sincerely,

Sharon K. Barnett
City Schools/University
Teacher Corps Barrel Project
Dear Parents:

We hope that you and your child(ren) are enjoying this year's school activities. Thank you for your participation in the "Learning Barrels" project this summer.

The Teacher Corps Project hopes that you will be able to schedule ten extra minutes during your conference time (see attached notice) so that we may discuss the progress your child has made by using the Learning Barrels with you. We plan to be at the following schools at the times listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Thursday, Nov. 13</th>
<th>6:00-8:30 pm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>Friday, Nov. 14</td>
<td>9:00-11:30 am</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Thursday, Nov. 13</th>
<th>6:00-8:30 pm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>Friday, Nov. 14</td>
<td>9:00-11:00 am</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please return the information below with your conference schedule to your child's teacher.

Sincerely,

Sharon Barnett
Teacher Corps

---------------------------------------------------------------

Child's Name___________________________________________

Parents' Name__________________________________________

School________________________________________________