SURVEY ACTIVITIES

RELATING TO

MASTERY LEARNING PROGRAMS

SURVEY ACTIVITIES

RELATING TO

MASTERY LEARNING PROGRAMS

Submitted to:

The Minnesota State Department of Education
Instructional Design Section
550 Cedar Street
St. Paul, MN 55101

Submitted by:

EMS/McGraw-Hill
9855 West 78th Street
Eden Prairie, MN 55344
(612) 829-8200

December. 14, 1987

TABLE OF CONTENTS

2.10 MINNEAPOLIS . . . . -123-

        2.10.1 Student Survey . . . . -123-

2.11 ALL SCHOOLS . . . . -125-

        2.11.1 Parent Survey . . . . -125-

        2.11.2 Student Survey . . . . -133-

        2.11.3 Teacher Survey . . . . -138-

III.   SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS . . . . -153-

        APPENDIX A - PARENT SURVEY A-1

        APPENDIX B - STUDENT SURVEY B-1

        APPENDIX C - TEACHER SURVEY C-1

I. DESCRIPTION OF SURVEY ACTIVITIES

EMS/McGraw-Hill administered parent, student, and teacher surveys to corresponding groups at the ten mastery learning demonstration sites. These sites are: (listed according to funding category):

Exemplary	Differentiated Staffing	Start-Up
Deer River	Staples	Minneapolis
Hopkins	Stillwater	Montgomery
Minnetonka		Wheaton
Montevideo		
St. Cloud		

A copy of each survey can be found in the Appendix. Only student surveys were administered in the Minneapolis school district.

The parent survey form was used to collect data concerning the parents' demographics, involvement, and opinions concerning their child's reading and the school reading program. The survey collected data concerning the level of formal education completed by the parents, and the number of children they currently had in school. Several possible modes of parental involvement in the mastery learning program were listed, from which the parent could check off the activities he/she was involved with. This was followed by 24 statements relating to their child and reading to which parents were to rate their agreement or disagreement on a scale of 1 to 4, where "1" indicated that the parent "strongly disagreed" and "4" meant that the parent "strongly agreed" with the statement. A "does not apply" option was also provided for these statements; however, the data concerning these statements is reported based on the parents who used one of the codes 1 to 4. The statements are worded so that responses of agreement or strong agreement are the desired or favorable outcome. The midpoint of this rating scale is 2.5; thus the overall rating of an item by a group of respondents is found to be favorable or unfavorable according to whether the average rating is greater than or less than 2.5. Another method of analysis with perhaps more intuitive meaning is to determine the percentage of respondents in agreement (codes 3 and 4) or disagreement (codes 1 and 2) with a statement.

Student surveys were given to students in the mastery learning reading programs at the ten demonstration sites. Most of these students are in grades K-3, although some fourth graders were also involved. The survey was designed to assess the student's attitudes toward reading and reading class by means of 17 brief statements for which the student was to check "yes" or "no." In some cases, students put their check midway between the "yes" and "no" blanks; this accounts for the "in-between" category included in the presentation of student survey results which follows.

The parent survey items were written so that an "agree" or "strongly agree" response was the desired response to each item. A similar pattern does not hold in terms of the student survey form. For the majority of the items, a high percentage of "yes" responses would be desired (for example, Item 1: "I like to read"). But for other items, one would hope to find mostly "no" responses (e.g., Item 9: "My reading class is boring"). Items of this nature (Items 5, 8, 9, 12, 13) are marked with an asterisk in the tables where the survey results are presented. In two other items (Items 10 and 11), it is unclear whether a "yes" or "no" response is the more favorable outcome. Item 10, "I know how well other students can read," is not an objective of the mastery learning program, nor does the program try to keep this a secret. We would like to see Item 11, "My friends all read well," answered "yes" if this meant that all of the student's classmates and acquaintances did read well; however, if students answer "yes" because they don't befriend poor readers (Item 12), this response would be less desirable.

The teachers completed the longest survey. It collected data on their grade level of instruction, teaching experience ("demographic data"), assistants, and workshops attended relating to the mastery learning. In addition, the survey had 37 statements to which the teachers were to respond on a scale of 1 to 4, and two items eliciting their views of strengths and weaknesses of mastery learning by their written comments. This survey was completed by teachers at all demonstration sites except for Minneapolis. In the sections to follow devoted to survey results from each demonstration site, the teacher survey section will present the findings concerning the grade level of instruction of the respondents in that district, demographic and inservice data, and their responses to the multiple-choice survey items. Section 2.11, which summarizes the teacher survey findings for all schools, includes a discussion of overall and individual school results of the teacher assistants and strengths/weaknesses sections.

The teacher opinion items followed the same rating scale as was used on the parent survey; teachers responded to the statements using a scale where "1" indicated strong disagreement and "4" indicated strong agreement. A "does not apply" option was also provided. The "mean response," the sum of the ratings (on the scale from 1 to 4) divided by the number of respondents, is used to assess the overall opinion of a group of teachers on an item. A rating of 2.5 is the midpoint of this rating scale; thus a rating above 2.5 indicates the teachers tended to agree with the item, and a rating above 2.7 indicates that a high percentage of respondents agreed (chose "3" or "4") with that item. In most cases, a rating above 2.5 on an item would indicate a favorable assessment of that aspect of the mastery learning program as implemented in their school. However, five items (10, 11, 15, 19, 28) were constructed so that disagreement (as indicated by a mean response of less than 2.5) indicates a favorable assessment of that aspect of the program. These items are asterisked in the tables which present the results of the teacher survey.

Section II of this report summarizes the survey data obtained from each of the mastery learning demonstration sites and gives overall results for each survey group. Section III presents conclusions and recommendations based on the survey and other evaluation activities.

II. SURVEY FINDINGS

Findings relating to surveys completed by each demonstration site are presented in this chapter.

2.1 STILLWATER

2.1.1 Parent Survey

The parent survey was administered to 144 Stillwater parents of elementary students. Demographic data obtained from the respondents is presented in Table 2.1. Stillwater parents are above average in formal education completed. Over 65% of the Stillwater parents reponding to the survey have had college education, as compared to less than 45% for the all-schools parent population. Along with Minnetonka and Hopkins, Stillwater families had the lowest average number of children in school based on the survey results. Table 2.2 summarizes the involvement of Stillwater parents in various aspects of the school reading program. Over half of the parents help their child complete homework assignments, attend conferences with the reading teacher, and have observed children during reading instruction. Sixty-two parents had attended meetings or workshops related to the mastery learning reading program. In comparison with the other schools in the program, Stillwater parents rated highest in observing children during reading instruction and lowest in helping their children with their homework. The latter finding may be justified if a large share of the respondents were parents of kindergarten and first-grade students who would rarely if ever have homework assignments; the distribution of student survey respondents by grade level (Table 2.4) would suggest this explanation.

Responses to the opinion items are contained in Table 2.3. Overall, Stillwater parents responded positively to the survey items, with most means exceeding 2.5, the midpoint of the rating scale. However, more than 50% of responding parents disagreed with Items 6, 10, 11, and 15. These dissenting parents do not feel more involved in their child's reading nor have they had more contact with their child's teachers since the mastery learning program was started. These parents responded that they have not received an explanation as to why their child is at their current level in reading. They also do not think the computer management reports have made them more aware of their child's reading skills.

Over 90% of responding parents agreed to Items 7, 8, 17, 20, and 23. These parents read to their children, and talk with them about the stories they read. They believe their child likes to read, and they limit the amount of time their child spends watching television. They agree that the reading program in their child's school aims to stimulate a desire to read on the part of every child.

Table 2.1

STILLWATER: PARENT SURVEY

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

N = 144

	Level of Formal Education									
	8th Grade or Less		High School Diploma		College		Masters		Ph.D.	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Mother	1	0.7%	46	33.6%	75	54.7%	13	9.5%	2	1.5%
Father	1	0.7	43	31.2	63	45.7	20	14.5	11	8.0

Number of Children in School	N	%
1	58	41.1%
2	59	41.8
3	20	14.2
4	3	2.1
5	1	0.7
6+	-	-

Table 2.2

STILLWATER: PARENT SURVEY

INVOLVEMENT WITH SCHOOL READING PROGRAM*
N = 144

Involvement	N	%*
Work with my child to complete homework assignments.	92	63.9%
Attend conferences with my child's reading teacher.	113	78.5
Attend meetings or workshops related to the mastery learning reading program.	62	43.1
Observe children during reading instruction.	79	54.9
Supervise students at school while they work on assignments.	18	12.5
Help to develop or organize curriculum/resource materials.	2	1.4
Work as a volunteer aide.	26	18.1
Work as a paid instructional aide.	5	3.5
Provide classroom instruction.	2	1.4
Provide input in decision making and policy.	3	2.1
Participate through a Parent Advisory Committee.	11	7.6

*Percentages do not add to 100% due to multiple responses.

Table 2.3

STILLWATER: PARENT OPINIONS

N = 144

			Scale							
Item	Mean Response	Strongly Disagree (1)		Disagree (2)		Agree (3)		Strongly Agree (4)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. It is easy for me to follow my child's progress in reading.	3.0	3	2.1%	25	17.6%	79	55.6%	35	24.6%
2. Reports produced through the computer management system were discussed during parent-teacher conferences.	2.9	8	6.1	27	20.6	71	54.2	25	19.1
3. I am regularly informed of the number and percentage of objectives my child attains in reading.	2.9	7	5.0	33	23.6	73	52.1	27	19.3
4. I am in regular contact with my child's teacher/teachers about his/her reading.	2.9	4	2.8	35	24.8	80	56.7	22	15.6
5. Materials are made available that I can use at home to help my child read.	2.8	9	7.0	33	25.6	59	45.7	28	21.7
6. Since the mastery learning program was started, I feel more involved in my child's reading.	2.4	12	10.0	59	49.2	41	34.2	8	6.7
7. I read stories to my child at home.	3.6	1	0.7	2	1.4	55	38.5	85	59.4
8. I talk with my child about the stories we read.	3.5	1	0.7	4	2.8	62	44.0	74	52.5
9. I encourage my children to make up their own stories.	3.3	1	0.7	18	12.9	62	44.3	59	42.1
10. I have more contact with my child's teacher/teachers since the mastery learning program was implemented.	2.2	12	10.9	69	62.7	28	25.5	1	0.9
11. Someone at the school has explained why my child was placed at their current level in reading.	2.4	17	13.1	51	39.2	51	39.2	11	8.5
12. I understand how reading is taught in the mastery learning reading program.	2.6	15	10.8	41	29.5	72	51.8	11	7.9

Table 2.3 - (cont'd)

STILLWATER: PARENT OPINIONS

N = 144

| | | Scale | | | | | | | |
| | | Strongly Disagree (1) | | Disagree (2) | | Agree (3) | | Strongly Agree (4) | |
Item	Mean Response	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
13. Reports produced through the computer management system make it easier to monitor my child's progress in reading.	2.5	13	9.9%	49	37.4%	55	42.0%	14	10.7%
14. I carefully follow my child's progress in reading.	3.1	2	1.4	17	12.0	86	60.6	37	26.1
15. Through the computer management reports, I have become more aware of my child's reading skills.	2.5	11	8.3	59	44.4	49	36.8	14	10.5
16. If my child masters all the objectives identified in the computer management report, then the instructional program is appropriate.	2.7	9	7.6	23	19.5	78	66.1	8	6.8
17. An objective of the reading program at our school is to stimulate a desire to read on the part of every child.	3.3	2	1.5	4	2.9	81	59.6	49	36.0
18. I talk with my child about his/her reading assignments.	3.1	2	1.5	13	9.5	86	62.8	36	26.3
19. If my child is not reading at a level I find acceptable, I increase the amount of time my child works on reading at home.	2.8	4	3.6	28	25.0	65	58.0	15	13.4
20. I limit the amount of time my child spends watching TV.	3.4	2	1.4	8	5.6	70	48.6	64	44.4
21. Teachers know what interests my child.	3.0	3	2.3	14	10.9	93	72.7	18	14.1
22. Reading instruction in our school has been significantly improved through adoption of the mastery learning approach.	2.7	6	7.1	20	23.5	54	63.5	5	5.9
23. My child enjoys reading.	3.4	1	0.7	6	4.2	66	45.8	71	49.3
24. My child reads library books on a regular basis.	3.3	1	0.7	14	9.9	67	47.5	59	41.8

2.1.2 Student Survey

Table 2.4 shows the distribution of the 321 Stillwater respondents by grade level. Children in kindergarten account for one-third of the Stillwater sample. Stillwater was the only school to give this survey to kindergarteners. On the other hand, only 4% of the sample are third graders, a much lower percentage than for the other schools.

Students responded positively to most of the survey items as shown in Table 2.5. Items 1, 2, 6, 14, and 17 all received 90% or better agreement from students, indicating that they like to read, read well, think reading class is fun, know what they are supposed to do in reading class, and think reading is important. Stillwater students had the most positive response of any school district to Item 2, "I read well" (96.0% answered "yes") and Item 6, "My reading class is fun" (90.2% yes). They were least apt of any of the schools to report that they read library books more often than last year (66.1% yes). This may be explained by the kindergarten children in the Stillwater sample, who may not have read library books during the survey year or the year before.

Two survey items received a split response. Just under half of the students (48.4%) responded "no" to Item 10, "I know how well other students can read." Just over half of the students (51.3%) responded that their reading class is too easy (Item 13), the only finding in the Stillwater student data which might be construed as undesirable.

2.1.3 Teacher Survey

The teacher survey was administered to 9 teachers from the Stillwater mastery learning demonstration site. Table 2.6 shows their distribution by grade level(s) of instruction.

Table 2.7 provides demographic data. This group of teachers has considerable teaching experience; eight of the nine teachers responding have 11 or more years of teaching experience. While most of the teachers have had some experience with differentiated staffing, they reported just one year of experience with mastery learning.

The Stillwater teachers tended to rate the survey items lower than did teachers overall, yet they responded quite positively to most items; Table 2.8 presents the findings. Item 7 received the lowest rating: just three of the nine Stillwater teachers responded to Item 7, yet all three disagreed with the statement "The mastery learning program has resulted in smaller reading groups." Four of six respondents felt that the computer management system in this school did not give them more time for classroom instruction. Five of nine respondents felt that the mastery learning inservices had not improved their skills in teaching reading.

Items 11, 15, and 26 also have very low means but indicate positive findings, with most teachers strongly disagreeing that "There is a shortage of appropriate resources for students who fail

Table 2.4
STILLWATER: STUDENT SURVEY - GRADE LEVEL OF RESPONDENTS
N = 321

Grade	N	%
K	101	33.8%
1	68	22.7
2	118	39.5
3	12	4.0

Table 2.5
STILLWATER: STUDENT SURVEY
N = 321

Item	Yes N	Yes %	In Between N	In Between %	No N	No %
1. I like to read.	298	92.8%	2	0.6%	21	6.5%
2. I read well.	308	96.0	1	0.3	12	3.7
3. I read at home.	284	89.3	1	0.3	33	10.4
4. In reading class, someone is always there to help me.	244	76.5	3	0.9	72	22.6
* 5. My reading class is too hard.	55	17.6	2	0.6	256	81.8
6. My reading class is fun.	286	90.2	2	0.6	29	9.1
7. I know how well I am doing in reading.	225	71.2	-	-	91	28.8
* 8. There are too many tests in my reading class.	64	20.4	-	-	249	79.6
* 9. My reading class is boring.	51	16.2	2	0.6	262	83.2
10. I know how well other students can read.	160	51.3	1	0.3	151	48.4
11. My friends all read well.	237	75.2	4	1.3	74	23.5
*12. I avoid students who don't read well.	104	33.4	2	0.6	205	65.9
*13. My reading class is too easy.	161	51.3	1	0.3	152	48.4
14. I know what I am supposed to do in my reading class.	287	91.1	3	1.0	25	7.9
15. I read library books more often than last year.	209	66.1	1	0.3	106	33.5
16. I know what I need to work on in reading.	272	87.5	1	0.3	38	12.2
17. Reading well is important.	293	96.4	-	-	11	3.6

*High percentage of "yes" responses indicates an unfavorable finding.

Table 2.6

STILLWATER: TEACHER SURVEY - GRADE LEVEL PRESENTLY TEACHING

N = 9

Grade	N	%
K	1	11.1%
K-1	1	11.1
K-2	3	33.3
2-3	1	11.1
1-3	3	33.3

Table 2.7

STILLWATER: TEACHER SURVEY - DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

N = 9

Number Of Years	Years Experience As Teacher		Years In District		Years In Grade		Years Teaching Reading		Years Experience With Differentiated Staffing		Years Experience With Mastery Learning	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1 - 5	1	11.1%	1	11.1%	3	33.3%	1	11.1%	4	44.4%	8	88.9%
6 - 10	-	-	2	22.2	2	33.3	1	11.1	-	-	-	-
11 - 15	3	33.3	2	22.2	-	-	3	33.3	2	22.2	-	-
16 - 20	2	22.2	2	22.2	2	22.2	1	11.1	1	11.1	-	-
21+	3	33.3	2	22.2	1	11.1	·3	33.3	-	-	-	-
0 or Blank	-	-	-	-	1	11.1	-	-	2	22.2	1	11.1

Highest Degree Earned	N	%
Bachelors	5	55.6%
Masters	3	33.3
Blank	1	11.1

Major	N	%
Elementary Education	8	88.9%
Blank	1	11.1

Table 2.8

STILLWATER: TEACHER OPINIONS

N = 9

Item	Mean Response	Scale							
		Strongly Disagree (1)		Disagree (2)		Agree (3)		Strongly Agree (4)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. At our school, important reading skills have been stated as measurable objectives.	4.0	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	9	100.0%
2. Objectives proposed for inclusion in our reading program were critically evaluated.	3.9	-	-	-	-	1	12.5	7	87.5
3. Objectives should be identified before the students interact with the curriculum.	2.9	-	-	2	22.2	6	66.7	1	11.1
4. Sufficient time was devoted to the identification of measurable objectives.	3.4	-	-	1	11.1	3	33.3	5	55.6
5. An initial assessment of the child's skill level is essential.	3.3	-	-	1	11.1	4	50.0	3	37.5
6. The diagnostic tests used in the initial placement of students were effective.	3.0	-	-	-	-	4	100.0	-	-
7. Use of the mastery learning program has resulted in smaller reading groups.	1.7	1	11.1	2	66.7	-	-	-	-
8. The computer management system reports provide excellent feedback for teachers.	2.9	-	-	4	44.4	2	22.2	3	33.3
9. Correctives and extensions are in place before students begin specific units.	3.4	-	-	-	-	5	55.6	4	44.4
*10. Mastery learning requires more time in teacher preparation than other ways of teaching.	2.1	2	25.0	3	37.5	3	37.5	-	-

*High mean response indicates an unfavorable finding.

-11-

Table 2.8 - (cont'd)

STILLWATER: TEACHER OPINIONS

N = 9

		Scale							
		Strongly Disagree (1)		Disagree (2)		Agree (3)		Strongly Agree (4)	
Item	Mean Response	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
*11. There is a shortage of appropriate resources for students who fail to reach the criterion after an initial presentation of the lesson.	1.6	5	55.6%	3	33.3%	1	11.1%	-	-%
12. Reports produced through the computer management system make it easy to monitor student progress in reading.	2.8	-	-	5	55.6	1	11.1	3	33.3
13. Since parents can readily follow their child's progress in reading, I can focus on other important issues during parent-teacher conferences.	2.7	1	11.1	1	11.1	7	77.8	-	-
14. Since our school adopted the computer management system, teachers can devote more time in classroom instruction.	2.3	1	16.7	3	50.0	1	16.7	1	16.7
*15. The computer management system detracts from the teaching of reading.	1.7	4	44.4	4	44.4	1	11.1	-	-
16. Clear guidelines have been established for matching assessment information with alternative teaching strategies.	3.1	-	-	-	-	8	88.9	1	11.1
17. The computer management system reports provide excellent feedback for parents.	3.2	-	-	2	22.2	3	33.3	4	44.4
18. A common commitment by the Board, administration, and teachers to the mastery learning program has helped to ensure its success.	3.2	-	-	1	11.1	5	55.6	3	33.3
*19. The usefulness of the mastery learning program varies depending on the child's ability.	2.1	2	22.2	5	55.6	1	11.1	1	11.1

*High mean response indicates an unfavorable finding.

Table 2.8 - (cont'd)

STILLWATER: TEACHER OPINIONS

N = 9

		Scale							
		Strongly Disagree (1)		Disagree (2)		Agree (3)		Strongly Agree (4)	
Item	Mean Response	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
20. Reading instruction in our school has been significantly improved through adoption of the mastery learning approach.	2.7	-	-%	3	33.3%	6	66.7%	-	-%
21. I can document positive change in the reading ability of students since the mastery learning program was adopted.	2.4	-	-	5	55.6	4	44.4	-	-
22. The computer management system has helped to individualize instruction.	3.0	1	11.1	1	11.1	4	44.4	3	33.3
23. I experience more satisfaction in my job as a teacher since the mastery learning program was adopted.	2.5	1	12.5	2	25.0	5	62.5	-	-
24. I feel more confident in my ability to teach reading since the mastery learning program was adopted.	2.8	-	-	3	33.3	5	55.6	1	11.1
25. Most teachers like the computer management system.	2.7	-	-	4	44.4	4	44.4	1	11.1
26. The mastery learning approach has broadened my definition of what it means to teach reading.	2.7	-	-	4	44.4	4	44.4	1	11.1
27. Clearly defined objectives ensure that the same curriculum is adopted by all elementary grade reading teachers.	2.6	1	11.1	3	33.3	4	44.4	1	11.1
*28. Work and time requirements involved in curriculum development, make mastery learning unfeasible in the long run.	1.7	4	44.4	4	44.4	1	11.1	-	-
29. The instructional practices utilized in mastery learning can be used to improve instruction in areas of learning other than reading.	3.6	-	-	-	-	4	44.4	5	55.6

*High mean response indicates an unfavorable finding.

Table 2.8 - (cont'd)

STILLWATER: TEACHER OPINIONS

N = 9

		Scale							
		Strongly Disagree (1)		Disagree (2)		Agree (3)		Strongly Agree (4)	
Item	Mean Response	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
30. Inservice related to the mastery learning program has improved my skills in teaching reading.	2.4	-	-%	5	55.6%	4	44.4%	-	-%
31. High quality materials for enrichment and extension activities are provided for students who have demonstrated a mastery of a specific skill.	3.2	-	-	-	-	7	77.8	2	22.2
32. The computer management system reports provide excellent feedback for students.	3.0	-	-	2	25.0	4	50.0	2	25.0
33. There are high quality materials available for re-teaching activities for students not mastering a specific skill after initial presentation.	3.3	-	-	-	-	6	66.7	3	33.3
34. Teachers spend less time in the recordkeeping process in mastery learning than in a conventional classroom.	2.8	-	-	3	37.5	4	50.0	1	12.5
35. The administration in the district is supportive of the mastery learning program.	3.3	-	-	-	-	6	66.7	3	33.3
36. The mastery learning program in this school district has been effectively and efficiently implemented.	2.6	-	-	2	40.0	3	60.0	-	-
37. Regular meetings are conducted to plan and keep people informed in regard to the project.	2.9	-	-	2	22.2	6	66.7	1	11.1

-14-

*High mean response indicates an unfavorable finding.

to reach the criterion after an initial presentation of the lesson,"
"The computer management system detracts from the teaching of reading,"
and "Work and time requirements involved in curriculum development
make mastery learning unfeasible in the long run."

Items rated very high were 1, 2, and 29. Teachers were in
complete strong agreement that "At our school, important reading skills
have been stated as measurable objectives." They also overwhelmingly
agreed with Item 2 which stated that "Objectives proposed for inclusion
in our reading program were critically evaluated." Stillwater teachers
were also in agreement with Item 29 regarding the usefulness of mastery
learning instructional practices in other areas of learning.

The survey included a section asking teachers to indicate what
classes, workshops, and inservice training they have been involved
in related to mastery learning. Table 2.9 presents this data. It
appears that most Stillwater teachers have participated in a variety of
training experiences. Nearly all the teachers responding had received
training in developing objectives; writing test items; mastery learning
program goals, objectives, and definition; and correlating resources to
objectives.

Table 2.9

STILLWATER: TEACHER SURVEY - INSERVICE DATA

N = 9

Inservice Training	N	%*
Developing objectives	8	88.9%
Writing test items	8	88.9
Computer management system	3	33.3
Mastery learning program goals, objectives, definition	7	77.7
Instructional techniques/strategies related to reading	4	44.4
Correctives development and/or use	4	44.4
Extensions development and/or use	3	33.3
Mastery learning programs in other districts	2	22.2
Correlating resources to objectives	8	88.8

*Percentages do not add to 100% due to multiple responses.

2.2 MINNETONKA

2.2.1 Parent Survey

The parent survey was administered to 104 Minnetonka parents of elementary students. Demographic data obtained from the respondents is presented in Table 2.10. Minnetonka parents have also completed a high level of formal education. Over 70% of Minnetonka mothers and fathers have had college training. By comparison, less than 45% of parents in the full sample reported this level of education.

Involvement of Minnetonka parents in various aspects of the school reading program is shown in Table 2.11. Eighty-nine percent of the parents responding work with their child to complete homework assignments. Over two-thirds attend conferences with their child's reading teacher. Parental involvement, as reflected by these survey items, is generally below average or average as compared to the full sample results, including some categories for which Minnetonka parents had the lowest percentages. Thus although Minnetonka was very active in disseminating their mastery learning program to other districts, they have room for improvement in keeping parents of their students informed and involved in the program.

Table 2.12 contains the results of the parent opinion items. Overall, Minnetonka parents responded positively to all but three survey items. More than 50% of responding parents disagreed with Items 10, 13, and 15. These dissenting parents have not had more contact with their child's teachers since the mastery learning program was implemented, nor do they believe in the helpfulness of the computer management system reports.

Over 90% of responding parents agreed to Items 7, 8, 17, 18, and 20. These parents read to their children and talk with them about what they have read. They also talk with their child about their reading assignments. They agree that "an objective of the reading program at our school is to stimulate a desire to read on the part of every child." They also limit the amount of time their child spends watching television.

2.2.2 Student Survey

Table 2.13 shows the distribution of Minnetonka students by grade level. Responses to the seventeen survey items are presented in Table 2.14. Responses to the survey items were strongly positive from this group of Minnetonka students. Items 1, 3, 5, 14, and 17 received 90% or better agreement from students. Items 3, 5, and 17 received the most positive ratings of any school district from this group. These items are: "I like to read" (91.3% yes), "I read at home" (90.7% yes), "My reading class is too hard" (90.9% no), "I know what I am supposed to do in reading class" (92.5% yes), and "Reading well is important" (98.4% yes).

No survey items had a majority of unfavorable responses, but 45.4% responded that their reading class is too easy (Item 13), while

Table 2.10

MINNETONKA: PARENT SURVEY - DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

N = 104

	Level of Formal Education									
	8th Grade or Less		HS Diploma		College		Masters		Ph.D.	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Mother	-	-%	27	26.7%	66	65.3%	8	7.9%	-	-%
Father	-	-	27	26.2	56	54.4	15	14.6	5	4.9

Number of Children in School	N	%
1	39	38.6%
2	49	48.5
3	9	8.9
4	2	2.0
5	1	1.0
6+	1	1.0

Table 2.11

MINNETONKA: PARENT SURVEY

INVOLVEMENT WITH SCHOOL READING PROGRAM

N = 104

Involvement	N	%*
Work with my child to complete homework assignments.	93	89.4%
Attend conferences with my child's reading teacher.	71	68.3
Attend meetings or workshops related to the mastery learning reading program.	7	6.7
Observe children during reading instruction.	14	13.5
Supervise students at school while they work on assignments.	9	8.7
Help to develop or organize curriculum/resource materials.	3	2.9
Work as a volunteer aide.	13	12.5
Work as a paid instructional aide.	4	3.8
Provide classroom instruction.	3	2.9
Provide input in decision making and policy.	2	1.9
Participate through a Parent Advisory Committee.	1	1.0

*Percentages do not add to 100% due to multiple responses.

Table 2.12

MINNETONKA: PARENT OPINIONS

N = 104

		Scale							
		Strongly Disagree (1)		Disagree (2)		Agree (3)		Strongly Agree (4)	
Item	Mean Response	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. It is easy for me to follow my child's progress in reading.	3.1	1	1.1%	14	14.9%	49	52.1%	30	31.9%
2. Reports produced through the computer management system were discussed during parent-teacher conferences.	2.5	4	9.1	16	36.4	20	45.5	4	9.1
3. I am regularly informed of the number and percentage of objectives my child attained in reading.	2.7	7	8.8	25	31.3	37	46.2	11	13.7
4. I am in regular contact with my child's teacher/teachers about his/her reading.	2.9	2	2.2	25	27.5	45	49.5	19	20.9
5. Materials are made available that I can use at home to help my child read.	3.1	1	1.1	17	19.1	45	50.6	26	29.2
6. Since the mastery learning program was started, I feel more involved in my child's reading.	2.9	3	3.8	24	30.8	32	41.0	19	24.4
7. I read stories to my child at home.	3.4	-	-	5	5.2	46	47.4	46	47.4
8. I talk with my child about the stories we read.	3.3	-	-	5	5.3	53	55.8	37	38.9
9. I encourage my children to make up their own stories.	3.1	1	1.1	17	19.5	45	51.7	24	27.6
10. I have more contact with my child's teacher/teachers since the mastery learning program was implemented.	2.5	3	4.3	36	52.2	21	30.4	9	13.0
11. Someone at the school has explained why my child was placed at their current level in reading.	2.8	7	8.0	23	26.1	41	46.6	17	19.3
12. I understand how reading is taught in the mastery learning reading program.	2.6	5	5.8	33	38.4	37	43.0	11	12.8

Table 2.12 - (cont'd)

MINNETONKA: PARENT OPINIONS

N = 104

			Scale						
Item	Mean Response	Strongly Disagree (1)		Disagree (2)		Agree (3)		Strongly Agree (4)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
13. Reports produced through the computer management system make it easier to monitor my child's progress in reading.	2.4	4	7.1%	27	48.2%	22	39.3%	3	5.4%
14. I carefully follow my child's progress in reading.	3.0	1	1.1	19	21.8	43	49.4	24	27.6
15. Through the computer management reports, I have become more aware of my child's reading skills.	2.4	3	5.9	29	56.9	17	33.3	2	3.9
16. If my child masters all the objectives identified in the computer management report, then the instructional program is appropriate.	2.8	-	-	12	28.6	25	59.5	5	11.9
17. An objective of the reading program at our school is to stimulate a desire to read on the part of every child.	3.5	-	-	2	2.3	39	44.3	47	53.4
18. I talk with my child about his/her reading assignments.	3.2	-	-	6	6.7	56	62.2	28	31.1
19. If my child is not reading at a level I find acceptable, I increase the amount of time my child works on reading at home.	2.9	1	1.3	19	24.4	46	59.0	12	15.4
20. I limit the amount of time my child spends watching TV.	3.3	1	1.1	2	2.2	57	61.3	33	35.5
21. Teachers know what interests my child.	3.2	-	-	9	10.6	51	60.0	25	29.4
22. Reading instruction in our school has been significantly improved through adoption of the mastery learning approach.	3.3	-	-	6	10.5	29	50.9	22	38.6
23. My child enjoys reading.	3.4	-	-	13	13.4	34	35.1	50	51.5
24. My child reads library books on a regular basis.	3.4	-	-	11	12.0	32	34.8	49	53.3

Table 2.13

MINNETONKA: STUDENT SURVEY - GRADE LEVEL OF RESPONDENTS

N = 330

Grade	N	%
1	117	36.9%
2	85	26.8
3	115	36.3

Table 2.14

MINNETONKA: STUDENT SURVEY

N = 330

Item	Yes		In Between		No	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. I like to read.	294	91.3%	2	0.6%	26	8.1%
2. I read well.	288	89.4	4	1.2	30	9.3
3. I read at home.	292	90.7	2	0.6	28	8.7
4. In reading class, someone is always there to help me.	256	79.8	5	1.6	60	18.7
* 5. My reading class is too hard.	28	8.8	1	0.3	291	90.9
6. My reading class is fun.	261	81.1	4	1.2	57	17.7
7. I know how well I am doing in reading.	233	73.3	3	0.9	82	25.8
* 8. There are too many tests in my reading class.	69	21.6	3	0.9	248	77.5
* 9. My reading class is boring.	81	25.6	3	0.9	232	73.4
10. I know how well other students can read.	206	64.8	1	0.3	111	34.9
11. My friends all read well.	224	70.4	6	1.9	88	27.7
*12. I avoid students who don't read well.	65	20.4	3	0.9	250	78.6
*13. My reading class is too easy.	144	45.4	6	1.9	167	52.7
14. I know what I am supposed to do in my reading class.	294	92.5	2	0.6	22	6.9
15. I read library books more often than last year.	255	80.4	2	0.6	60	18.9
16. I know what I need to work on in reading.	262	83.4	4	1.3	48	15.3
17. Reading well is important.	312	98.4	-	-	5	1.6

*High percentage of "yes" responses indicates an unfavorable finding.

only 8.8% said "My reading class is too hard" (Item 5).

2.2.3   Teacher Survey

Forty Minnetonka teachers participated in the survey. Table
2.15 shows that all who indicated their grade level were primary
teachers, fairly evenly distributed among first, second, and third
grades.

This group of teachers overall has impressive teaching
experience and longevity with the Minnetonka district as is
summarized in Table 2.16. Forty percent of these teachers have
had over five years of experience with mastery learning.

Two notable patterns can be discerned in Table 2.17, which
summarizes teacher responses to the 37 opinion items. A majority
(25 or more) of the teachers marked "does not apply" to every item
which mentioned the "computer management system" (Items 8, 12, 14,
15, 17, 22, 25, 32). As was indicated in the January 1987 Evaluation
of the Mastery Learning Program, grades 1 and 2 did not have a
computer management system in place, which accounts for the low
number of responses to these items.

Remarkably, for each of the 37 survey items, the Minnetonka
teachers either responded less positively (often much less so) or
else had an equal mean response, compared to the overall sample of
teachers from all demonstration sites. Twelve items received an
overall unfavorable response in comparison to the midpoint of 2.5
(Items 7, 11, 13, 14, 16, 17, 22, 25, 32, 33, 34, and 37), while six
other items had means of 2.5. Teachers in the other schools tend to
rate nearly all of the items quite favorably. Factors contributing
to Minnetonka's relative dissatisfaction may include their lack of
an effective computer management system for all grades involved, and
their dissatisfaction with the Harcourt Brace Jovanovich materials as
indicated by their written comments on the survey forms. Items with
the lowest mean responses include "Use of the mastery learning program
has resulted in smaller reading groups" (Item 7, mean = 1.9); "Most
teachers like the computer management system" (Item 25, 1.7); "The
computer management system reports provide excellent feedback for
students" (Item 32, 1.9); "There are high quality materials available
for reteaching activities for students not mastering a skill after
initial presentation" (Item 33, 2.0).

Items rated very high were 1 through 5, which stated the
importance of measurable objectives and skill assessment, with means
of 3.0 or higher in all instances. Additionally, Item 9 regarding
the use of correctives and extensions was rated very positively, with
a mean of 3.0.

The other survey item that drew an overall positive response
was Item 35 regarding the support of district administration for the
mastery learning program. Ninety-five percent of teachers agreed or
strongly agreed with that assessment.

Table 2.15
MINNETONKA: TEACHER SURVEY - GRADE LEVEL PRESENTLY TEACHING
N = 40

Grade	N	%
1	14	37.8%
2	14	37.8
3	9	24.3

Table 2.16
MINNETONKA: TEACHER SURVEY - DEMOGRAPHIC DATA
N = 40

Number Of Years	Years Experience As Teacher		Years In District		Years In Grade		Years Teaching Reading		Years Experience With Differentiated Staffing		Years Experience With Mastery Learning	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1 - 5	3	7.5%	4	10.0%	18	45.0%	3	7.5%	2	5.0%	13	32.5%
6 - 10	2	5.0	2	5.0	11	27.5	4	10.0	-	-	5	12.5
11 - 15	4	10.0	4	10.0	2	5.0	4	10.0	1	2.5	9	22.5
16 - 20	10	25.0	11	27.5	2	5.0	9	22.5	3	7.5	-	-
21+	19	47.5	18	45.0	6	15.0	17	42.5	2	5.0	2	5.0
0 or Blank	2	5.0	1	2.5	1	2.5	3	7.5	32	80.0	11	27.5

Highest Degree Earned	N	%
Bachelors	28	70.0%
Masters	9	22.5
Blank	3	7.5

Major	N	%
Elementary Education	29	72.5%
Reading	1	2.5
Blank	10	25.0

Table 2.17

MINNETONKA: TEACHER OPINIONS

N = 40

| | | Scale | | | | | | | |
| | Mean | Strongly Disagree (1) | | Disagree (2) | | Agree (3) | | Strongly Agree (4) | |
Item	Response	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. At our school, important reading skills have been stated as measurable objectives.	3.7	1	2.5%	1	2.5%	9	22.5%	29	72.5%
2. Objectives proposed for inclusion in our reading program were critically evaluated.	3.0	2	5.1	5	12.8	24	61.5	8	20.5
3. Objectives should be identified before the students interact with the curriculum.	3.6	-	-	-	-	16	40.0	24	60.0
4. Sufficient time was devoted to the identification of measurable objectives.	3.0	2	5.3	6	15.8	21	55.3	9	23.7
5. An initial assessment of the child's skill level is essential.	3.4	-	-	4	10.5	14	36.8	20	52.6
6. The diagnostic tests used in the initial placement of students were effective.	2.7	4	12.9	7	22.6	14	45.2	6	19.4
7. Use of the mastery learning program has resulted in smaller reading groups.	1.9	12	33.3	18	50.0	4	11.1	2	5.6
8. The computer management system reports provide excellent feedback for teachers.	2.5	4	28.6	2	14.3	5	35.7	3	21.4
9. Correctives and extensions are in place before students begin specific units.	3.0	2	5.7	8	22.9	13	37.1	12	34.3
*10. Mastery learning requires more time in teacher preparation than other ways of teaching.	2.5	3	7.9	17	44.7	15	39.5	3	7.9

*High mean response indicates an unfavorable finding.

Table 2.17 - (cont'd)

MINNETONKA: TEACHER OPINIONS
N = 40

		Scale							
	Mean	Strongly Disagree (1)		Disagree (2)		Agree (3)		Strongly Agree (4)	
Item	Response	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
*11. There is a shortage of appropriate resources for students who fail to reach the criterion after an initial presentation of the lesson.	2.6	-	-%	22	55.0%	14	35.0%	4	10.0%
12. Reports produced through the computer management system make it easy to monitor student progress in reading.	2.6	2	13.3	4	26.7	7	46.7	2	13.3
13. Since parents can readily follow their child's progress in reading, I can focus on other important issues during parent-teacher conferences.	2.1	11	28.2	17	43.6	9	23.1	2	5.1
14. Since our school adopted the computer management system, teachers can devote more time in classroom instruction.	2.1	4	28.6	4	28.6	6	42.9	-	-
*15. The computer management system detracts from the teaching of reading.	2.1	4	26.7	7	46.7	3	20.0	1	6.7
16. Clear guidelines have been established for matching assessment information with alternative teaching strategies.	2.3	4	10.8	24	64.9	4	10.8	5	13.5
17. The computer management system reports provide excellent feedback for parents.	2.2	3	23.1	5	38.5	4	30.8	1	7.7
18. A common commitment by the Board, administration, and teachers to the mastery learning program has helped to ensure its success.	2.9	-	-	7	18.9	28	75.7	2	5.4
*19. The usefulness of the mastery learning program varies depending on the child's ability.	2.5	1	2.7	21	56.8	10	27.0	5	13.5

*High mean response indicates an unfavorable finding.

Table 2.17 - (cont'd)

MINNETONKA: TEACHER OPINIONS

N = 40

Item	Mean Response	Scale							
		Strongly Disagree (1)		Disagree (2)		Agree (3)		Strongly Agree (4)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
20. Reading instruction in our school has been significantly improved through adoption of the mastery learning approach.	2.7	6	16.2%	6	16.2%	18	48.6%	7	18.9%
21. I can document positive change in the reading ability of students since the mastery learning program was adopted.	2.8	4	12.1	8	24.2	13	39.4	8	24.2
22. The computer management system has helped to individualize instruction.	2.2	2	16.7	7	58.3	2	16.7	1	8.3
23. I experience more satisfaction in my job as a teacher since the mastery learning program was adopted.	2.5	3	9.4	14	43.8	10	31.3	5	15.6
24. I feel more confident in my ability to teach reading since the mastery learning program was adopted.	2.7	2	5.7	12	34.3	15	42.9	6	17.1
25. Most teachers like the computer management system.	1.7	6	46.2	5	38.5	2	15.4	-	-
26. The mastery learning approach has broadened my definition of what it means to teach reading.	2.5	5	13.9	11	30.6	17	47.2	3	8.3
27. Clearly defined objectives ensure that the same curriculum is adopted by all elementary grade reading teachers.	2.9	3	7.9	7	18.4	18	47.4	10	26.3
*28. Work and time requirements involved in curriculum development, make mastery learning unfeasible in the long run.	2.0	6	17.1	22	62.9	7	20.0	-	-
29. The instructional practices utilized in mastery learning can be used to improve instruction in areas of learning other than reading.	3.0	-	-	3	7.9	30	78.9	5	13.2

*High mean response indicates an unfavorable finding.

Table 2.17 - (cont'd)

MINNETONKA: TEACHER OPINIONS

N = 40

			Scale							
			Strongly Disagree (1)		Disagree (2)		Agree (3)		Strongly Agree (4)	
Item	Mean Response	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
30. Inservice related to the mastery learning program has improved my skills in teaching reading.	2.5	7	20.0%	10	28.6%	10	28.6%	8	22.9%	
31. High quality materials for enrichment and extension activities are provided for students who have demonstrated a mastery of a specific skill.	2.7	5	13.9	8	22.2	16	44.4	7	19.4	
32. The computer management system reports provide excellent feedback for students.	1.9	7	50.0	3	21.4	2	14.3	2	14.3	
33. There are high quality materials available for re-teaching activities for students not mastering a specific skill after initial presentation.	2.0	10	27.8	17	47.2	9	25.0	-	-	
34. Teachers spend less time in the recordkeeping process in mastery learning than in a conventional classroom.	2.2	7	19.4	17	47.2	10	27.8	2	5.6	
35. The administration in the district is supportive of the mastery learning program.	3.3	-	-	2	5.4	21	56.8	14	37.8	
36. The mastery learning program in this school district has been effectively and efficiently implemented.	2.9	4	11.1	7	19.4	14	38.9	11	30.6	
37. Regular meetings are conducted to plan and keep people informed in regard to the project.	2.2	13	34.2	8	21.1	15	39.5	2	5.3	

*High mean response indicates an unfavorable finding.

Table 2.18 presents the data pertaining to classes, workshops, and inservice training taken by Minnetonka teachers related to mastery learning. Many of the teachers have been involved with a variety of training experiences. Almost half of the teachers responding had received training in instructional techniques/strategies for reading. About one-fourth have had training with extensions; mastery learning program goals, objectives, and definition; and mastery learning programs in other districts.

Table 2.18

MINNETONKA: TEACHER SURVEY - INSERVICE DATA

N = 40

Inservice Training	N	%*
Developing objectives	6	15.0%
Writing test items	2	5.0
Computer management system	3	7.5
Mastery learning program goals, objectives, definition	9	22.5
Instructional techniques/strategies related to reading	18	45.0
Correctives development and/or use	7	17.5
Extensions development and/or use	10	25.0
Mastery learning programs in other districts	12	30.0
Correlating resources to objectives	4	10.0

*Percentages do not add to 100% due to multiple responses.

2.3 HOPKINS

2.3.1 Parent Survey

Demographic data obtained from the 134 Hopkins parent respondents is presented in Table 2.19. This data again shows the pattern of the suburban schools, of a higher level of education on the part of the parents and fewer children per family in school.

Table 2.20 shows Hopkins parents' involvement in various aspects of the school reading program. A high percentage of responding parents work with their child to complete homework assignments and attend conferences with their child's reading teacher. Over one-quarter of this group of parents work as volunteer aides.

Responses to the opinion items are contained in Table 2.21. With one exception, 65% or better of this group of Hopkins parents agreed with all the survey statements, with means ranging from 2.9 to 3.6. On several items the Hopkins parents had the highest mean response of any school district, which also reflects this pattern of hearty agreement on the survey items. Just over half of the parents responding (54.6%) disagreed with Item 10, in which it was stated that they have had more contact with their child's teacher since the mastery learning program was implemented.

Items 1, 7, 8, 14, 17, 23, and 24 received means of 3.5 or 3.6 indicating very strong agreement by respondents. These items, plus Items 3, 13, 18, 20, 21, and 22, were all agreed with by over 90% of the respondents. These statements reflect the parent's high overall interest and involvement in their child's reading progress as well as the perception that their child enjoys reading and reads regularly. They agree that the school's reading program seeks to stimulate a desire to read among all students and feel that the school keeps them informed as to their child's reading progress. Ninety-one percent believe that the mastery learning program has significantly improved reading instruction in their school.

2.3.2 Student Survey

The student survey was administered to 516 Hopkins elementary school students. Table 2.22 shows their distribution by grade level, while Table 2.23 presents their responses to the survey items.

Students responded positively to most of the survey items. Items 1, 2, 3, 5, 14, and 17 all received 90% or better agreement from students, indicating that these students like to read, read well, read at home, know what to do in reading class, think reading well is important, and think that their reading class is not too hard. Hopkins students had the highest percentage of "no" responses, of all the schools, to four items for which "no" was the favorable response: "There are too many tests in my reading class," "My reading class is boring," "I avoid students who don't read well," and "My reading class is too easy." They also had the highest percentage of "nos" (41.6%) to the item "My friends all read well."

Table 2.19

HOPKINS: PARENT SURVEY - DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

N = 134

	Level of Formal Education									
	8th Grade or Less		HS Diploma		College		Masters		Ph.D.	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Mother	–	–%	34	26.0%	86	65.6%	11	8.4%	–	–%
Father	1	0.8	32	25.0	64	50.0	26	20.3	5	3.9

Number of Children in School	N	%
1	45	34.1%
2	69	52.3
3	14	10.6
4	1	0.8
5	2	1.5
6+	1	0.8

Table 2.20

HOPKINS: PARENT SURVEY

INVOLVEMENT WITH SCHOOL READING PROGRAM

N = 134

Involvement	N	%*
Work with my child to complete homework assignments.	124	92.5%
Attend conferences with my child's reading teacher.	110	82.1
Attend meetings or workshops related to the mastery learning reading program.	11	8.2
Observe children during reading instruction.	20	14.9
Supervise students at school while they work on assignments.	9	6.7
Help to develop or organize curriculum/resource materials.	10	7.5
Work as a volunteer aide.	38	28.4
Work as a paid instructional aide.	2	1.5
Provide classroom instruction.	4	3.0
Provide input in decision making and policy.	6	4.5
Participate through a Parent Advisory Committee.	12	9.0

*Percentages do not add to 100% due to multiple responses.

Table 2.21

HOPKINS: PARENT OPINIONS

N = 134

		Scale							
		Strongly Disagree (1)		Disagree (2)		Agree (3)		Strongly Agree (4)	
Item	Mean Response	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. It is easy for me to follow my child's progress in reading.	3.5	-	-%	2	1.5%	68	51.5%	62	47.0%
2. Reports produced through the computer management system were discussed during parent-teacher conferences.	3.3	3	2.4	12	9.7	56	45.2	53	42.7
3. I am regularly informed of the number and percentage of objectives my child attains in reading.	3.4	-	-	5	3.8	64	48.9	62	47.3
4. I am in regular contact with my child's teacher/teachers about his/her reading.	3.2	1	0.8	15	12.0	72	57.6	37	29.6
5. Materials are made available that I can use at home to help my child read.	3.0	2	1.8	24	21.4	58	51.8	28	25.0
6. Since the mastery learning program was started, I feel more involved in my child's reading.	2.9	2	2.1	28	29.5	47	49.5	18	18.9
7. I read stories to my child at home.	3.6	-	-	3	2.3	43	32.8	85	64.9
8. I talk with my child about the stories we read.	3.5	-	-	3	2.3	54	41.5	73	54.5
9. I encourage my children to make up their own stories.	3.2	-	-	15	11.5	70	53.8	45	34.6
10. I have more contact with my child's teacher/teachers since the mastery learning program was implemented.	2.5	2	2.3	45	52.3	31	36.0	8	9.3
11. Someone at the school has explained why my child was placed at their current level in reading.	3.2	2	2.3	20	15.4	59	45.4	48	36.9
12. I understand how reading is taught in the mastery learning reading program.	3.1	3	2.4	22	17.6	65	52.0	35	28.0

Table 2.21 - (cont'd)

HOPKINS: PARENT OPINIONS

N = 134

		Scale							
		Strongly Disagree (1)		Disagree (2)		Agree (3)		Strongly Agree (4)	
Item	Mean Response	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
13. Reports produced through the computer management system make it easy to monitor my child's progress in reading.	3.3	-	-%	9	7.3%	69	55.6%	46	37.1%
14. I carefully follow my child's progress in reading.	3.5	-	-	3	2.3	64	49.6	62	48.1
15. Through the computer management reports, I have been more aware of my child's reading skills.	3.2	1	0.8	14	10.9	66	51.2	48	37.2
16. If my child masters all the objectives identified in the computer management report, then the instructional program is appropriate.	3.0	1	0.8	18	15.0	83	69.2	18	15.0
17. An objective of the reading program at our school is to stimulate a desire to read on the part of every child.	3.5	-	-	2	1.6	53	42.1	71	56.3
18. I talk with my child about his/her reading assignments.	3.3	-	-	5	3.9	76	59.8	46	36.2
19. If my child is not reading at a level I find acceptable, I increase the amount of time my child works on reading at home.	2.9	2	2.0	28	27.5	53	52.0	19	18.6
20. I limit the amount of time my child spends watching TV.	3.3	1	0.8	8	6.3	74	58.7	43	34.1
21. Teachers know what interests my child.	3.2	-	-	6	5.1	80	68.4	31	26.5
22. Reading instruction in our school has been significantly improved through adoption of the mastery learning approach.	3.1	-	-	7	9.1	55	71.4	15	19.5
23. My child enjoys reading.	3.6	1	0.8	-	-	44	34.1	84	65.1
24. My child reads library books on a regular basis.	3.6	-	-	5	3.8	47	35.9	79	60.3

Table 2.22
HOPKINS: STUDENT SURVEY - GRADE LEVEL OF RESPONDENTS
N = 516

Grade	N	%
1	99	19.7%
2	196	39.0
3	163	32.5
4	35	7.0
5	3	0.6
6	6	1.2

Table 2.23
HOPKINS: STUDENT SURVEY
N = 516

Item	Yes N	Yes %	In Between N	In Between %	No N	No %
1. I like to read.	476	93.9%	2	0.4%	29	5.7%
2. I read well.	463	91.1	2	0.4	43	8.5
3. I read at home.	456	90.1	-	-	50	9.9
4. In reading class, someone is always there to help me.	440	87.5	-	-	63	12.5
* 5. My reading class is too hard.	42	8.4	4	0.8	455	90.8
6. My reading class is fun.	447	88.9	1	0.2	55	10.9
7. I know how well I am doing in reading.	393	78.0	-	-	111	22.0
* 8. There are too many tests in my reading class.	53	10.5	-	-	450	89.5
* 9. My reading class is boring.	72	14.4	-	-	427	85.6
10. I know how well other students can read.	305	61.4	-	-	192	38.6
11. My friends all read well.	294	58.4	-	-	209	41.6
*12. I avoid students who don't read well.	63	12.6	-	-	437	87.4
*13. My reading class is too easy.	170	33.9	2	0.4	329	65.7
14. I know what I am supposed to do in my reading class.	470	93.8	-	-	31	6.2
15. I read library books more often than last year.	413	82.3	1	0.2	88	17.5
16. I know what I need to work on in reading.	446	88.8	-	-	56	11.2
17. Reading well is important.	463	95.9	-	-	20	4.1

*High percentage of "yes" responses indicates an unfavora   :inding.

2.3.3 Teacher Survey

Table 2.24 presents the distribution of Hopkins teachers in the survey by grade level(s) of instruction. With 111 teachers completing the survey, Hopkins teachers constitute 40% of the entire sample of teacher survey respondents. Included among the respondents are at least 29 fifth and sixth grade teachers, reflecting Hopkins' use of mastery learning techniques in the intermediate grades, as well as in the primary grades.

The Hopkins teachers are exceptionally experienced, as Table 2.25 shows. Over 90% have more than ten years of experience; over three-fourths of the respondents have taught for more than fifteen years. Yet all those responding have fewer than five years' experience with mastery learning.

The Hopkins teachers gave highly positive responses to all but one of the 37 opinion items (see Table 2.26), reflecting their enthusiasm for the mastery learning program. Item 7 was the one exception; opinion was divided as to whether using the mastery learning program has resulted in smaller reading groups.

Hopkins teachers unanimously agreed with Items 1, 2, 4, 35, and 36, while all but one respondent agreed to Items 3, 8, 9, and 18, findings which are especially remarkable considering the sample size. They reflect the teachers' satisfaction with the way in which the mastery learning program has been implemented in their district. These items are:

1. At our school, important reading skills have been stated as measurable objectives.
2. Objectives proposed for inclusion in our reading program were critically evaluated.
3. Objectives should be identified before the students interact with the curriculum.
4. Sufficient time was devoted to the identification of measurable objectives.
8. The computer management system reports provide excellent feedback for teachers.
9. Correctives and extensions are in place before students begin specific units.
18. A common commitment by the Board, administration, and teachers to the mastery learning program has helped to ensure its success.
35. The administration in the district is supportive of the mastery learning program.
36. The mastery learning program in this school district has been effectively and efficiently implemented.

Table 2.27 shows the training of the teachers in aspects of mastery learning. Over half of those responding have trained in the computer management system, mastery learning program goals, objectives, and definition, and instructional techniques/strategies related to reading. A substantial number have also studied the development and/or use of correctives and extensions, and the correlating of resources to objectives.

Table 2.24

HOPKINS: TEACHER SURVEY

GRADE LEVEL PRESENTLY TEACHING

N = 111

Grade Level	N	%
1	12	13.3%
2	7	7.8
3	5	5.6
4	7	7.8
5	5	5.6
6	6	6.7
K - 6	6	6.7
1 - 2	4	4.4
2 - 3	4	4.4
3 - 4	15	16.7
5 - 6	18	20.0
3 - 6	1	1.1

Table 2.25
HOPKINS: TEACHER SURVEY - DEMOGRAPHIC DATA
N = 111

Number Of Years	Years Experience As Teacher		Years In District		Years In Grade		Years Teaching Reading		Years Experience With Differentiated Staffing		Years Experience With Mastery Learning	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1 - 5	-	-%	2	1.8%	26	23.4%	2	1.8%	-	-%	106	95.5%
6 - 10	3	2.7	12	10.8	23	20.7	8	7.2	-	-	-	-
11 - 15	17	15.3	14	12.6	13	11.7	16	14.4	1	0.9	-	-
16 - 20	45	40.5	51	45.9	19	17.1	42	37.8	3	2.7	-	-
21+	40	36.0	25	22.5	11	9.9	33	29.7	1	0.9	-	-
0 or Blank	6	5.4	7	6.3	19	17.1	10	9.0	106	95.5	5	4.5

Highest Degree Earned	N	%
Bachelors	71	64.0%
Masters	26	23.4
Blank	14	12.6

Major	N	%
Elementary Education	76	68.5%
Reading	2	1.8
Educational Administration	1	0.9
Educational Psychology	1	0.9
Curriculum & Instruction	1	0.9
Psychology/Counseling	1	0.9
Special Education	4	3.6
Blank	25	22.5

Table 2.26

HOPKINS: TEACHER OPINIONS

N = 111

		Scale							
	Mean	Strongly Disagree (1)		Disagree (2)		Agree (3)		Strongly Agree (4)	
Item	Response	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. At our school, important reading skills have been stated as measurable objectives.	3.9	-	-%	-	-%	12	10.9%	98	89.1%
2. Objectives proposed for inclusion in our reading program were critically evaluated.	3.7	-	-	-	-	32	28.8	79	71.2
3. Objectives should be identified before the students interact with the curriculum.	3.6	-	-	1	0.9	45	41.3	63	57.8
4. Sufficient time was devoted to the identification of measurable objectives.	3.8	-	-	-	-	19	17.1	92	82.9
5. An initial assessment of the child's skill level is essential.	3.8	-	-	2	1.8	23	20.9	85	77.3
6. The diagnostic tests used in the initial placement of students were effective.	3.4	2	1.9	3	2.8	55	50.9	48	44.4
7. Use of the mastery learning program has resulted in smaller reading groups.	2.5	10	9.8	40	39.2	41	40.2	11	10.8
8. The computer management system reports provide excellent feedback for teachers.	3.8	1	0.9	-	-	17	15.3	93	83.8
9. Correctives and extensions are in place before students begin specific units.	3.6	-	-	1	0.9	42	39.3	64	59.8
*10. Mastery learning requires more time in teacher preparation than other ways of teaching.	1.7	45	40.9	51	46.4	11	10.0	3	2.7

*High mean response indicates an unfavorable finding.

Table 2.26 - (cont'd)

HOPKINS: TEACHER OPINIONS

N = 111

			Scale						
Item	Mean Response	Strongly Disagree (1)		Disagree (2)		Agree (3)		Strongly Agree (4)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
*11. There is a shortage of appropriate resources for students who fail to reach the criterion after an initial presentation of the lesson.	2.0	33	29.7%	54	48.6%	20	18.0%	4	3.6%
12. Reports produced through the computer management system make it easy to monitor student progress in reading.	3.7	-	-	2	0.9	26	23.4	84	75.7
13. Since parents can readily follow their child's progress in reading, I can focus on other important issues during parent-teacher conferences.	3.0	1	0.9	28	25.5	52	47.3	29	26.4
14. Since our school adopted the computer management system, teachers can devote more time in classroom instruction.	3.2	1	0.9	12	11.0	62	56.9	34	31.2
*15. The computer management system detracts from the teaching of reading.	1.4	66	60.6	40	36.7	1	0.9	2	1.8
16. Clear guidelines have been established for matching assessment information with alternative teaching strategies.	3.0	1	0.9	22	20.6	64	59.8	20	18.7
17. The computer management system reports provide excellent feedback for parents.	3.6	1	0.9	1	0.9	35	31.5	74	66.7
18. A common commitment by the Board, administration, and teachers to the mastery learning program has helped to ensure its success.	3.7	-	-	1	0.9	28	25.2	82	73.9
*19. The usefulness of the mastery learning program varies depending on the child's ability.	2.1	26	23.6	51	46.4	31	28.2	2	1.8

*High mean response indicates an unfavorable finding.

Table 2.26 - (cont'd)

HOPKINS: TEACHER OPINIONS
N = 111

		Scale							
		Strongly Disagree (1)		Disagree (2)		Agree (3)		Strongly Agree (4)	
Item	Mean Response	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
20. Reading instruction in our school has been significantly improved through adoption of the mastery learning approach.	3.2	-	-%	12	11.1%	61	56.5%	35	32.4%
21. I can document positive change in the reading ability of students since the mastery learning program was adopted.	3.0	2	2.0	17	17.2	55	55.6	25	25.3
22. The computer management system has helped to individualize instruction.	3.4	-	-	5	4.7	58	54.2	44	41.1
23. I experience more satisfaction in my job as a teacher since the mastery learning program was adopted.	3.1	-	-	13	13.3	60	61.2	25	25.5
24. I feel more confident in my ability to teach reading since the mastery learning program was adopted.	2.9	2	2.0	25	25.0	55	55.0	18	18.0
25. Most teachers like the computer management system.	3.4	-	-	4	3.8	52	49.1	50	47.2
26. The mastery learning approach has broadened my definition of what it means to teach reading.	2.9	4	4.0	25	24.8	53	52.5	19	18.8
27. Clearly defined objectives ensure that the same curriculum is adopted by all elementary grade reading teachers.	3.5	1	0.9	2	1.9	44	41.1	60	56.1
*28. Work and time requirements involved in curriculum development, make mastery learning unfeasible in the long run.	1.5	62	56.9	44	40.4	2	1.8	1	0.9
29. The instructional practices utilized in mastery learning can be used to improve instruction in areas of learning other than reading.	3.2	1	0.9	8	7.5	65	60.7	33	30.8

*High mean response indicates an unfavorable finding.

-42-

Table 2.26 - (cont'd)

HOPKINS: TEACHER OPINIONS

N = 111

Item	Mean Response	Scale							
		Strongly Disagree (1)		Disagree (2)		Agree (3)		Strongly Agree (4)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
30. Inservice related to the mastery learning program has improved my skills in teaching reading.	3.1	2	1.9%	13	12.5%	59	56.7%	30	28.8%
31. High quality materials for enrichment and extension activities are provided for students who have demonstrated a mastery of a specific skill.	3.3	2	1.9	9	8.5	55	51.9	40	37.7
32. The computer management system reports provide excellent feedback for students.	3.5	2	1.9	2	1.9	45	41.7	59	54.6
33. There are high quality materials available for re-teaching activities for students not mastering a specific skill after initial presentation.	3.0	1	0.9	22	20.2	60	55.0	26	23.9
34. Teachers spend less time in the recordkeeping process in mastery learning than in a conventional classroom.	3.5	-	-	7	6.4	41	37.6	61	56.0
35. The administration in the district is supportive of the mastery learning program.	3.8	-	-	-	-	20	18.3	89	81.7
36. The mastery learning program in this school district has been effectively and efficiently implemented.	3.8	-	-	-	-	25	23.1	83	76.9
37. Regular meetings are conducted to plan and keep people informed in regard to the project.	3.4	-	-	6	5.6	54	50.5	47	43.9

*High mean response indicates an unfavorable finding.

Table 2.27

HOPKINS: TEACHER SURVEY - INSERVICE DATA

N = 111

Inservice Training	N	%*
Developing objectives	5	4.5%
Writing test items	6	5.4
Computer management system	57	51.3
Mastery learning program goals, objectives, definition	59	53.2
Instructional techniques/strategies related to reading	59	53.2
Correctives development and/or use	36	32.4
Extensions development and/or use	48	43.2
Mastery learning programs in other districts	13	11.7
Correlating resources to objectives	39	35.1

*Percentages do not add to 100% due to multiple responses.

2.4 MONTGOMERY

2.4.1 Parent Survey

Demographic data obtained from the 189 Montgomery respondents is presented in Table 2.28. Less than 25% of these parents have had college education, as compared to nearly 75% in Hopkins and Minnetonka.

Table 2.29 details the involvement of Montgomery parents in various aspects of the school reading program. Nearly all of the parents responding work with their child to complete homework assignments, and most attend conferences with their child's reading teacher. Almost half of those responding attend meetings or workshops related to the mastery learning reading program. Montgomery parents rated lowest in supervising students at school and working as volunteer aides.

Responses to the opinion items are listed in Table 2.30. Overall, Montgomery parents responded positively to the survey items, with most means exceeding 2.5. However, 54% of parents responding disagreed with Item 10, regarding increased contact with their child's teachers since implementation of the mastery learning program.

Over 90% of parents responding agreed with Items 1, 7, 8, 14, 17, 18, 22, 23, and 24, with means of 3.2 or better. These parents follow their child's progress in reading and participate with them in reading activities. They agree that the reading program at their school seeks to stimulate a desire to read on the part of every child, and that the reading program has improved significantly through adoption of the mastery learning program. They perceive that their child enjoys reading and reads library books regularly.

2.4.2 Student Survey

Tables 2.31 and 2.32 give the grade level distribution and survey responses of the 205 Montgomery elementary school respondents.

Students reponded positively to most of the survey items. Over 85% of students agreed to Items 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 14, and 17. These students like to read, read well, and read at home. They agree that there is always help available in reading class and that reading class is fun. They know their responsibilities in reading class and believe reading well is important. In addition, over 85% answered "no" to the items "My reading class is too hard" and "There are too many tests in my reading class."

One survey item received a split response. Just over half of the students (55.9%) believe that their reading class is too easy, while the remaining students (44.1%) do not agree with this.

The only item which received an unfavorable response from the majority of Montgomery students was Item 13, "My reading class is too easy," to which 55.9% answered "yes."

Table 2.28

MONTGOMERY: PARENT SURVEY - DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

N = 189

	Level of Formal Education									
	8th Grade or Less		HS Diploma		College		Masters		Ph.D.	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Mother	7	3.8%	140	75.7%	37	20.0%	1	0.5%	–	–%
Father	14	8.0	120	68.2	41	23.3	–	–	1	0.6

Number of Children in School	N	%
1	60	32.1%
2	72	38.5
3	39	20.9
4	11	5.9
5	2	1.1
6+	3	1.6

Table 2.29

MONTGOMERY: PARENT SURVEY

INVOLVEMENT WITH SCHOOL READING PROGRAM

N = 189

Involvement	N	%*
Work with my child to complete homework assignments.	184	97.4%
Attend conferences with my child's reading teacher.	152	80.4
Attend meetings or workshops related to the mastery learning reading program.	93	49.2
Observe children during reading instruction.	73	38.6
Supervise students at school while they work on assignments.	9	4.8
Help to develop or organize curriculum/resource materials.	8	4.2
Work as a volunteer aide.	7	3.7
Work as a paid instructional aide.	4	2.1
Provide classroom instruction.	2	1.1
Provide input in decision making and policy.	4	2.1
Participate through a Parent Advisory Committee.	8	4.2

*Percentages do not add to 100% due to multiple responses.

Table 2.30

MONTGOMERY: PARENT OPINIONS

N = 189

Item	Mean Response	Strongly Disagree (1) N	Strongly Disagree (1) %	Disagree (2) N	Disagree (2) %	Agree (3) N	Agree (3) %	Strongly Agree (4) N	Strongly Agree (4) %
1. It is easy for me to follow my child's progress in reading.	3.3	-	-%	8	4.7%	105	61.4%	58	33.9%
2. Reports produced through the computer management system were discussed during parent-teacher conferences.	2.8	7	4.9	36	25.0	75	53.5	24	16.7
3. I am regularly informed of the number and percentage of objectives my child attains in reading.	3.0	3	1.9	25	15.7	101	63.5	30	18.9
4. I am in regular contact with my child's teacher/teachers about his/her reading.	3.0	2	1.2	26	15.9	107	65.2	29	17.7
5. Materials are made available that I can use at home to help my child read.	3.0	2	1.2	26	15.8	104	63.0	33	20.0
6. Since the mastery learning program was started, I feel more involved in my child's reading.	3.0	3	1.9	33	21.0	88	56.1	33	21.0
7. I read stories to my child at home.	3.3	1	0.5	8	4.4	110	60.4	63	34.6
8. I talk with my child about the stories we read.	3.2	1	0.5	12	6.6	120	65.9	49	26.9
9. I encourage my children to make up their own stories.	2.9	3	1.7	30	17.2	118	67.8	23	13.2
10. I have more contact with my child's teacher/teachers since the mastery learning program was implemented.	2.5	5	3.6	70	50.4	54	38.8	10	7.2
11. Someone at the school has explained why my child was placed at their current level in reading.	2.9	7	4.4	25	15.6	106	66.2	22	13.7
12. I understand how reading is taught in the mastery learning reading program.	3.0	3	1.7	29	16.8	112	64.7	29	16.8

Table 2.30 - (cont'd)

MONTGOMERY: PARENT OPINIONS

N = 189

			Scale							
	Mean	Strongly Disagree (1)		Disagree (2)		Agree (3)		Strongly Agree (4)	
Item	Response	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
13. Reports produced through the computer management system make it easier to monitor my child's progress in reading.	3.0	4	2.5%	29	18.4%	94	59.5%	31	19.6%
14. I carefully follow my child's progress in reading.	3.2	-	-	13	7.6	115	66.9	44	25.6
15. Through the computer management reports, I have become more aware of my child's reading skills.	2.9	5	3.3	28	18.3	98	64.1	22	14.4
16. If my child masters all the objectives identified in the computer management report, then the instructional program is appropriate.	3.0	3	1.9	23	14.8	105	67.7	24	15.5
17. An objective of the reading program at our school is to stimulate a desire to read on the part of every child.	3.3	-	-	3	1.7	119	68.4	52	29.9
18. I talk with my child about his/her reading assignments.	3.2	-	-	12	6.9	120	68.6	43	24.6
19. If my child is not reading at a level I find acceptable, I increase the amount of time my child works on reading at home.	2.9	3	1.9	38	23.8	93	58.1	26	16.2
20. I limit the amount of time my child spends watching TV.	3.0	1	0.6	22	12.2	131	72.8	26	14.4
21. Teachers know what interests my child.	2.9	1	0.6	30	18.1	117	70.5	18	10.8
22. Reading instruction in our school has been significantly improved through adoption of the mastery learning approach.	3.3	1	0.7	6	4.0	93	62.4	49	32.9
23. My child enjoys reading.	3.4	1	0.6	9	5.0	87	48.6	82	45.8
24. My child reads library books on a regular basis.	3.4	-	-	14	8.0	85	48.9	75	43.1

Table 2.31

MONTGOMERY: STUDENT SURVEY - GRADE LEVEL OF RESPONDENTS

N = 205

Grade	N	%
1	80	39.0%
2	67	32.7
3	58	28.3

Table 2.32

MONTGOMERY: STUDENT SURVEY

N = 205

Item	Yes		In Between		No	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. I like to read.	182	89.7%	-	-%	21	10.3%
2. I read well.	175	85.8	-	-	29	14.2
3. I read at home.	174	85.7	-	-	29	14.3
4. In reading class, someone is always there to help me.	180	89.6	-	-	21	10.4
* 5. My reading class is too hard.	29	14.5	-	-	171	85.5
6. My reading class is fun.	174	86.1	-	-	28	13.9
7. I know how well I am doing in reading.	163	79.9	-	-	41	20.1
* 8. There are too many tests in my reading class.	30	14.8	-	-	173	85.2
* 9. My reading class is boring.	50	24.6	-	-	153	75.4
10. I know how well other students can read.	164	80.4	-	-	40	19.6
11. My friends all read well.	161	79.7	-	-	41	20.3
*12. I avoid students who don't read well.	57	28.2	-	-	145	71.8
*13. My reading class is too easy.	113	55.9	-	-	89	44.1
14. I know what I am supposed to do in my reading class.	182	90.1	-	-	20	9.9
15. I read library books more often than last year.	163	80.7	-	-	39	19.3
16. I know what I need to work on in reading.	169	84.1	-	-	32	15.9
17. Reading well is important.	192	96.5	-	-	7	3.5

*High percentage of "yes" responses indicates an unfavorable finding.

2.4.3 Teacher Survey

The teacher survey was administered to 12 Montgomery teachers, including three teachers each of kindergarten, first, second, and third grades, as shown in Table 2.33.

Table 2.34 shows the experience of the Montgomery teachers. While most have several years of teaching experience, all report that they have had only one year of experience with the mastery learning approach.

Responses to the opinion items in Table 2.35 indicates that the Montgomery teachers were very pleased with the mastery learning program. Items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 17, 20, 23, 25, 29, 35, 36, and 37 met with unanimous agreement, while several other items were only one person short of unanimity. These items relate to: implementing carefully planned, measurable objectives; initial assessments of student skills; the cooperation of all district personnel in effectively implementing the program, and the effectiveness of the computer management system for various tasks, including providing excellent feedback to teachers, parents, and students. All the respondents "agree" or "strongly agree" that they experience more satisfaction in teaching since the mastery learning program was adopted, and all but one feel more confident in teaching reading since using the mastery learning approach.

Items which received lower ratings include Items 7, 10, and 13. Several teachers do not agree that the mastery learning program has resulted in smaller reading groups; more than half of the respondents feel that mastery learning requires more teacher preparation time than other teaching models; opinion is divided as to parents' ability to follow their children's progress in reading.

All twelve of the Montgomery teachers have had training in the mastery learning program goals, objectives, and definition. Nine have received some form of training in instructional techniques/strategies related to reading, and ten had received training in correlating resources to objectives. None had received training in developing objectives or writing test items. (See Table 2.36.)

Table 2.33

MONTGOMERY: TEACHER SURVEY - GRADE LEVEL PRESENTLY TEACHING

N = 12

Grade	N	%
K	3	25%
1	3	25
2	3	25
3	3	25

Table 2.34

MONTGOMERY: TEACHER SURVEY - DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

N = 12

Number Of Years	Years Experience As Teacher		Years In District		Years In Grade		Years Teaching Reading		Years Experience With Differentiated Staffing		Years Experience With Mastery Learning	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1 - 5	3	25.0%	4	33.3%	5	41.6%	3	25.0%	1	8.3%	12	100.0%
6 - 10	2	16.6	4	33.3	4	33.3	3	25.0	-	-	-	-
11 - 15	3	25.0	2	16.7	2	16.6	3	25.0	-	-	-	-
16 - 20	2	16.7	1	8.3	-	-	1	8.3	-	-	-	-
21+	2	16.6	1	8.3	1	8.3	2	16.7	-	-	-	-
0 or Blank	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	11	91.7	-	-

Highest Degree Earned	N	%
Bachelors	10	83.3%
Masters	1	8.3
Blank	1	8.3

Major	N	%
Elementary Education	11	91.7%
Blank	1	8.3

Table 2.35

MONTGOMERY: TEACHER OPINIONS

N = 12

		Scale							
		Strongly Disagree (1)		Disagree (2)		Agree (3)		Strongly Agree (4)	
Item	Mean Response	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. At our school, important reading skills have been stated as measurable objectives.	3.8	-	-%	-	-%	2	16.7%	10	83.3%
2. Objectives proposed for inclusion in our reading program were critically evaluated.	3.7	-	-	-	-	4	33.3	8	66.7
3. Objectives should be identified before the students interact with the curriculum.	3.8	-	-	-	-	3	25.0	9	75.0
4. Sufficient time was devoted to the identification of measurable objectives.	3.5	-	-	-	-	6	50.0	6	50.0
5. An initial assessment of the child's skill level is essential.	3.8	-	-	-	-	3	25.0	9	75.0
6. The diagnostic tests used in the initial placement of students were effective.	3.3	-	-	-	-	7	70.0	3	30.0
7. Use of the mastery learning program has resulted in smaller reading groups.	2.5	2	16.7	3	25.0	6	50.0	1	8.3
8. The computer management system reports provide excellent feedback for teachers.	3.9	-	-	-	-	1	11.1	8	88.9
9. Correctives and extensions are in place before students begin specific units.	3.1	-	-	1	11.1	6	66.7	2	22.2
*10. Mastery learning requires more time in teacher preparation than other ways of teaching.	2.8	1	8.3	4	33.3	3	25.0	4	33.3

*High mean response indicates an unfavorable finding.

Table 2.35 - (cont'd)

MONTGOMERY: TEACHER OPINIONS

N = 12

Item	Mean Response	Strongly Disagree (1) N	%	Disagree (2) N	%	Agree (3) N	%	Strongly Agree (4) N	%
*11. There is a shortage of appropriate resources for students who fail to reach the criterion after an initial presentation of the lesson.	2.3	1	8.3%	7	58.3%	4	33.3%	-	-%
12. Reports produced through the computer management system make it easy to monitor student progress in reading.	3.3	-	-	1	11.1	4	44.4	4	44.4
13. Since parents can readily follow their child's progress in reading, I can focus on other important issues during parent-teacher conferences.	2.6	-	-	6	50.0	5	41.7	1	8.3
14. Since our school adopted the computer management system, teachers can devote more time in classroom instruction.	3.3	-	-	1	11.1	4	44.4	4	44.4
*15. The computer management system detracts from the teaching of reading.	1.7	4	44.4	4	44.4	1	11.1	-	-
16. Clear guidelines have been established for matching assessment information with alternative teaching strategies.	2.6	-	-	4	36.4	7	63.6	-	-
17. The computer management system reports provide excellent feedback for parents.	3.7	-	-	-	-	3	33.3	6	66.7
18. A common commitment by the Board, administration, and teachers to the mastery learning program has helped to ensure its success.	3.8	1	8.3	-	-	-	-	11	91.7
*19. The usefulness of the mastery learning program varies depending on the child's ability.	2.3	2	16.7	5	41.7	4	33.3	1	8.3

*High mean response indicates an unfavorable finding.

Table 2.35 - (cont'd)

MONTGOMERY: TEACHER OPINIONS

N = 12

		Scale								
			Strongly Disagree (1)		Disagree (2)		Agree (3)		Strongly Agree (4)	
	Mean									
Item	Response	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
20. Reading instruction in our school has been significantly improved through adoption of the mastery learning approach.	3.8	-	-%	-	-%	2	16.7%	10	83.3%
21. I can document positive change in the reading ability of students since the mastery learning program was adopted.	3.4	-	-	1	9.1	5	45.5	5	45.5
22. The computer management system has helped to individualize instruction.	3.5	-	-	1	12.5	2	25.0	5	62.5
23. I experience more satisfaction in my job as a teacher since the mastery learning program was adopted.	3.6	-	-	-	-	5	41.7	7	58.3
24. I feel more confident in my ability to teach reading since the mastery learning program was adopted.	3.6	-	-	1	11.1	2	22.2	6	66.7
25. Most teachers like the computer management system.	3.7	-	-	-	-	3	33.3	6	66.7
26. The mastery learning approach has broadened my definition of what it means to teach reading.	3.3	-	-	1	9.1	6	54.5	4	36.4
27. Clearly defined objectives ensure that the same curriculum is adopted by all elementary grade reading teachers.	3.3	1	8.3	-	-	6	50.0	5	41.7
*28. Work and time requirements involved in curriculum development, make mastery learning unfeasible in the long run.	1.7	6	50.0	5	41.7	-	-	1	8.3
29. The instructional practices utilized in mastery learning can be used to improve instruction in areas of learning other than reading.	3.3	-	-	-	-	8	66.7	4	33.3

*High mean response indicates an unfavorable finding.

Table 2.35 - (cont'd)

MONTGOMERY: TEACHER OPINIONS

N = 12

			Scale						
		Strongly Disagree (1)		Disagree (2)		Agree (3)		Strongly Agree (4)	
Item	Mean Response	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
30. Inservice related to the mastery learning program has improved my skills in teaching reading.	2.9	-	-%	2	16.7%	9	75.0%	1	8.3%
31. High quality materials for enrichment and extension activities are provided for students who have demonstrated a mastery of a specific skill.	2.8	-	-	5	41.7	5	41.7	2	16.7
32. The computer management system reports provide excellent feedback for students.	3.4	-	-	1	11.1	3	33.3	5	55.6
33. There are high quality materials available for re-teaching activities for students not mastering a specific skill after initial presentation.	2.8	-	-	5	41.7	5	41.7	2	16.7
34. Teachers spend less time in the recordkeeping process in mastery learning than in a conventional classroom.	3.3	-	-	3	27.3	2	18.2	6	54.5
35. The administration in the district is supportive of the mastery learning program.	3.8	-	-	-	-	3	25.0	9	75.0
36. The mastery learning program in this school district has been effectively and efficiently implemented.	3.6	-	-	-	-	5	41.7	7	58.3
37. Regular meetings are conducted to plan and keep people informed in regard to the project.	3.4	-	-	-	-	7	63.6	4	36.4

*High mean response indicates an unfavorable finding.

Table 2.36

MONTGOMERY: TEACHER SURVEY - INSERVICE DATA

N = 12

Inservice Training	N	%*
Developing objectives	-	-%
Writing test items	-	-
Computer management system	9	75.0
Mastery learning program goals, objectives, definition	12	100.0
Instructional techniques/strategies related to reading	9	75.0
Correctives development and/or use	7	58.3
Extensions development and/or use	7	58.3
Mastery learning programs in other districts	3	25.0
Correlating resources to objectives	10	83.3

*Percentages do not add to 100% due to multiple responses.

2.5 WHEATON

2.5.1 Parent Survey

Demographic data obtained from the Wheaton respondents is presented in Table 2.37. Their level of formal education is the highest of the rural demonstration sites.

The involvement of Wheaton parents in many aspects of the reading program was exceptional, as is shown in Table 2.38. They had the highest percentage of parents involved in six categories, and were above average in three more, as compared to the other schools and the overall parent results. In helping their child with homework (98.2%), attending conferences with their reading teacher (89.1%), attending mastery learning meetings (71.8%), helping prepare curriculum/resource materials (10.0%), participating in the Parent Advisory Committee (13.6%), and providing input in decision making and policy (7.3%), Wheaton had the highest percentage of parents reporting their involvement. In addition, over half of the parents have observed reading instruction and over one-third have worked as a volunteer aide, results which are also much better than average.

As is shown in Table 2.39, Wheaton parents responded very positively to the survey items, with all the means ranging from 2.9 to 3.6. Over 90% of respondents agreed with 18 of the 24 survey items. Their positive responses indicate that these Wheaton parents are involved in their child's reading progress, are happy with the mastery learning program as instituted by the teachers at Wheaton, and appreciate the computer management reports on their child's reading progress.

2.5.2 Student Survey

The student survey was administered to 119 Wheaton elementary school students. Table 2.40 shows a very balanced distribution of first, second, and third grade respondents.

Eight items (1, 2, 3, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17) were answered favorably by over 85% of the students, as shown in Table 2.41; these students reported that they like to read, read well, read at home, know what to do in reading class, read more library books than last year, know what they need to work on in reading, believe reading well is important, and do not avoid poor readers. However, a majority (59.5%) respond that their reading class is too easy (Item 13).

Wheaton students were most apt to report that they "read library books more often than last year," at 88.6%. However, they had the lowest rate of favorable responses of all the schools to five items: "In reading class, someone is always there to help me" (59.3% yes), "My reading class is too hard" (18,9% yes, 80.3% no), "I know how well I am doing in reading" (66.7% yes), "My reading class is boring" (32.8% yes, 67.2% no), and "My reading class is too easy" (59.5% yes, 40.5% no).

Table 2.37

WHEATON: PARENT SURVEY - DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

N = 110

	8th Grade or Less		HS Diploma		College		Masters		Ph.D.	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Mother	-	-%	60	56.6%	46	43.4%	-	-%	-	-%
Father	2	1.9	53	51.5	43	41.7	3	2.9	2	1.9

Number of Children in School	N	%
1	29	26.9%
2	47	43.5
3	23	21.3
4	9	8.3
5	-	-
6+	-	-

Table 2.38

WHEATON: PARENT SURVEY

INVOLVEMENT WITH SCHOOL READING PROGRAM

N = 110

Involvement	N	%*
Work with my child to complete homework assignments.	108	98.2%
Attend conferences with my child's reading teacher.	98	89.1
Attend meetings or workshops related to the mastery learning reading program.	79	71.8
Observe children during reading instruction.	60	54.5
Supervise students at school while they work on assignments.	24	21.8
Help to develop or organize curriculum/resource materials.	11	10.0
Work as a volunteer aide.	38	34.5
Work as a paid instructional aide.	1	0.9
Provide classroom instruction.	3	2.7
Provide input in decision making and policy.	8	7.3
Participate through a Parent Advisory Committee.	15	13.6

*Percentages do not add to 100% due to multiple responses.

Table 2.39

WHEATON: PARENT OPINIONS

N = 110

Item	Mean Response	Strongly Disagree (1)		Disagree (2)		Agree (3)		Strongly Agree (4)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. It is easy for me to follow my child's progress in reading.	3.6	1	0.9%	3	2.8%	38	35.8%	64	60.4%
2. Reports produced through the computer management system were discussed during parent-teacher conferences.	3.6	1	1.0	3	2.9	35	33.7	65	62.5
3. I am regularly informed of the number and percentage of objectives my child attains in reading.	3.5	1	1.0	2	1.9	47	45.2	54	51.9
4. I am in regular contact with my child's teacher/teachers about his/her reading.	3.1	1	1.0	12	11.9	61	60.4	27	26.7
5. Materials are made available that I can use at home to help my child.	3.1	3	3.1	14	14.3	56	57.1	25	25.5
6. Since the mastery learning program was started, I feel more involved in my child's reading.	3.4	1	1.0	6	6.0	49	49.0	44	44.0
7. I read stories to my child at home.	3.5	-	-	4	3.9	44	42.7	55	53.4
8. I talk with my child about the stories we read.	3.3	-	-	9	8.7	50	48.1	45	43.3
9. I encourage my children to make up their own stories.	2.9	1	1.0	21	21.6	59	60.8	16	16.5
10. I have more contact with my child's teacher/teachers since the mastery learning program was implemented.	2.9	3	3.1	25	26.0	49	51.0	19	19.8
11. Someone at the school has explained why my child was placed at their current level in reading.	2.9	-	-	3	3.1	23	23.7	47	48.5
12. I understand how reading is taught in the mastery learning reading program.	3.2	1	1.0	5	4.9	64	62.7	32	31.4

Table 2.39 - (cont'd)

WHEATON: PARENT OPINIONS

N = 110

| | | | Scale | | | | | | | |
| Item | Mean Response | Strongly Disagree (1) | | Disagree (2) | | Agree (3) | | Strongly Agree (4) | |
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
13. Reports produced through the computer management system make it easier to monitor my child's progress in reading.	3.4	2	2.0%	6	5.9%	44	43.1%	50	49.0%
14. I carefully follow my child's progress in reading.	3.4	-	-	6	5.9	46	45.5	49	48.5
15. Through the computer management reports, I have become more aware of my child's reading skills.	3.4	2	2.0	7	6.9	42	41.2	51	50.0
16. If my child masters all the objectives identified in the computer management report, then the instructional program is appropriate.	3.3	-	-	6	6.1	58	59.2	34	34.7
17. An objective of the reading program at our school is to stimulate a desire to read on the part of every child.	3.5	1	1.0	1	1.0	42	40.8	59	57.3
18. I talk with my child about his/her reading assignments.	3.3	-	-	5	4.9	65	63.7	32	31.4
19. If my child is not reading at a level I find acceptable, I increase the amount of time my child works on reading at home.	2.9	2	2.4	11	13.1	62	73.8	9	10.7
20. I limit the amount of time my child spends watching TV.	3.0	2	2.1	17	18.1	57	60.6	18	19.1
21. Teachers know what interests my child.	3.0	1	1.1	8	8.7	71	77.2	12	13.0
22. Reading instruction in our school has been significantly improved through adoption of the mastery learning approach.	3.4	1	1.1	2	2.2	48	51.6	42	45.2
23. My child enjoys reading.	3.6	1	1.0	1	1.0	36	35.3	64	62.7
24. My child reads library books on a regular basis.	3.5	-	-	6	6.1	35	35.7	57	51.8

Table 2.40

WHEATON: STUDENT SURVEY - GRADE LEVEL OF RESPONDENTS

N = 119

Grade	N	%
1	40	32.3%
2	44	35.5
3	39	31.5
4	1	0.8

Table 2.41

WHEATON: STUDENT SURVEY

N = 119

Item	Yes N	Yes %	In Between N	In Between %	No N	No %
1. I like to read.	109	89.3%	1	0.8%	12	9.8%
2. I read well.	112	91.8	1	0.8	9	7.4
3. I read at home.	107	87.7	1	0.8	14	11.5
4. In reading class, someone is always there to help me.	73	59.3	2	1.6	48	39.0
* 5. My reading class is too hard.	23	18.9	1	0.8	98	80.3
6. My reading class is fun.	101	84.2	-	-	19	15.8
7. I know how well I am doing in reading.	80	66.7	-	-	40	33.3
* 8. There are too many tests in my reading class.	46	37.7	-	-	76	62.3
* 9. My reading class is boring.	40	32.8	-	-	82	67.2
10. I know how well other students can read.	79	65.3	-	-	42	34.7
11. My friends all read well.	82	68.3	-	-	38	31.7
*12. I avoid students who don't read well.	17	14.4	-	-	101	85.6
*13. My reading class is too easy.	72	59.5	-	-	49	40.5
14. I know what I am supposed to do in my reading class.	112	91.8	-	-	10	8.2
15. I read library books more often than last year.	109	88.6	-	-	14	11.4
16. I know what I need to work on in reading.	109	89.3	-	-	13	10.7
17. Reading well is important.	107	96.4	-	-	4	3.6

*High percentage of "yes" responses indicates an unfavorable finding.

2.5.3 Teacher Survey

Twelve Wheaton teachers completed the survey. However (perhaps in the interes   of anonymity), nearly all of them left the survey entirely blank p to the first multiple-choice item. Thus no data is available as to the grade levels taught by these teachers, their teaching experience, educational background, and so on.

Responses to the 37 multiple-choice opinion items in Table 2.42 show that the mastery learning program has been a very rewarding experience for the Wheaton teachers. Teachers gave a unanimous positive response to three-fifths of the survey items, and several other items showed near unanimity.

Some major themes in these many items with broad agreement included: implementing carefully planned, measurable objectives for their reading program; cooperation of all school district personnel to implement the program effectively; the effectiveness of the computer management system in helping individualize instruction and provide feedback to students, teacher, and parents. Item 8, "The computer management system reports provide excellent feedback for teachers," had a perfect mean response of 4.0 as all teachers strongly agreed with this statement. All teachers responding felt that the mastery learning program in their school significantly improved reading instruction (Item 20) and made these teachers feel more confident in their ability to teach reading (Item 24); all but one respondent said they experience more job satisfaction as a teacher since the mastery learning program was adopted (Item 23). The only item with an unfavorable response was Item 10, "Mastery learning requires more time in teacher preparation than other ways of teaching;" nine of the twelve teachers agreed with this statement. Yet all but one teacher disagreed with Item 28, "Work and time requirements involved in curriculum development make mastery learning unfeasible in the long run."

Table 2.43 shows that several Wheaton teachers have received inservice training in many different aspects of the mastery learning program. Nine of the twelve teachers had training in the computer management system and eight have received training in mastery learning program goals, objectives, and definition.

Table 2.42

WHEATON: TEACHER OPINIONS

N = 12

Item	Mean Response	Strongly Disagree (1)		Disagree (2)		Agree (3)		Strongly Agree (4)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. At our school, important reading skills have been stated as measurable objectives.	3.7	-	-%	-	-%	4	33.3%	8	66.7%
2. Objectives proposed for inclusion in our reading program were critically evaluated.	3.4	-	-	-	-	6	60.0	4	40.0
3. Objectives should be identified before the students interact with the curriculum.	3.8	-	-	-	-	3	25.0	9	75.0
4. Sufficient time was devoted to the identification of measurable objectives.	3.3	-	-	-	-	9	75.0	3	25.0
5. An initial assessment of the child's skill level is essential.	3.5	-	-	-	-	5	45.5	6	54.5
6. The diagnostic tests used in the initial placement of students were effective.	3.0	-	-	2	16.7	8	66.7	2	16.7
7. Use of the mastery learning program has resulted in smaller reading groups.	3.2	-	-	2	20.0	4	40.0	4	40.0
8. The computer management system reports provide excellent feedback for teachers.	4.0	-	-	2	-	-	-	12	100.0
9. Correctives and extensions are in place before students begin specific units.	3.1	-	-	-	-	10	90.9	1	9.1
*10. Mastery learning requires more time in teacher preparation than other ways of teaching.	3.0	-	-	3	25.0	6	50.0	3	25.0

*High mean response indicates an unfavorable finding.

-65-

Table 2.42 - (cont'd)

WHEATON: TEACHER OPINIONS
N = 12

			Scale							
Item	Mean Response	Strongly Disagree (1) N	%	Disagree (2) N	%	Agree (3) N	%	Strongly Agree (4) N	%
*11. There is a shortage of appropriate resources for students who fail to reach the criterion after an initial presentation of the lesson.	2.0	1	8.3%	10	83.3%	1	8.3%	-	-%
12. Reports produced through the computer management system make it easy to monitor student progress in reading.	3.8	-	-	-	-	2	16.7	10	83.3
13. Since parents can readily follow their child's progress in reading, I can focus on other important issues during parent-teacher conferences.	2.8	-	-	4	33.3	7	58.3	1	8.3
14. Since our school adopted the computer management system, teachers can devote more time in classroom instruction.	2.9	-	-	3	25.0	7	58.3	2	16.7
*15. The computer management system detracts from the teaching of reading.	1.7	3	27.3	8	72.7	-	-	-	-
16. Clear guidelines have been established for matching assessment information with alternative teaching strategies.	3.0	-	-	1	8.3	3	83.3	1	8.3
17. The computer management system reports provide excellent feedback for parents.	3.8	-	-	-	-	3	25.0	9	75.0
18. A common commitment by the Board, administration, and teachers to the mastery learning program has helped to ensure its success.	3.5	-	-	-	-	6	50.0	6	50.0
*19. The usefulness of the mastery learning program varies depending on the child's ability.	1.8	3	25.0	8	66.7	1	8.3	-	-

*High mean response indicates an unfavorable finding.

Table 2.42 - (cont'd)

WHEATON: TEACHER OPINIONS

N = 12

		Scale							
		Strongly Disagree (1)		Disagree (2)		Agree (3)		Strongly Agree (4)	
Item	Mean Response	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
20. Reading instruction in our school has been significantly improved through adoption of the mastery learning approach.	3.1	-	-%	-	-%	8	66.7%	1	11.1%
21. I can document positive change in the reading ability of students since the mastery learning program was adopted.	2.8	-	-	3	30.0	6	60.0	1	10.0
22. The computer management system has helped to individualize instruction.	3.5	-	-	-	-	6	54.5	5	45.5
23. I experience more satisfaction in my job as a teacher since the mastery learning program was adopted.	3.1	-	-	1	10.0	7	70.0	2	20.0
24. I feel more confident in my ability to teach reading since the mastery learning program was adopted.	3.3	-	-	-	-	8	72.7	3	27.3
25. Most teachers like the computer management system.	3.4	-	-	-	-	5	55.6	4	44.4
26. The mastery learning approach has broadened my definition of what it means to teach reading.	3.1	-	-	-	-	10	90.9	1	9.1
27. Clearly defined objectives ensure that the same curriculum is adopted by all elementary grade reading teachers.	3.1	-	-	-	-	10	90.9	1	9.1
*28. Work and time requirements involved in curriculum development, make mastery learning unfeasible in the long run.	2.0	1	9.1	9	81.8	1	9.1	-	-
29. The instructional practices utilized in mastery learning can be used to improve instruction in areas of learning other than reading.	3.0	-	-	1	9.1	9	81.8	1	9.1

*High mean response indicates an unfavorable finding.

Table 2.42 - (cont'd)

WHEATON: TEACHER OPINIONS

N = 12

Item	Mean Response	Strongly Disagree (1)		Disagree (2)		Agree (3)		Strongly Agree (4)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
30. Inservice related to the mastery learning program has improved my skills in teaching reading.	3.1	-	-%	1	11.1%	6	66.7%	2	22.2%
31. High quality materials for enrichment and extension activities are provided for students who have demonstrated a mastery of a specific skill.	3.2	-	-	-	-	9	81.8	2	18.2
32. The computer management system reports provide excellent feedback for students.	3.3	-	-	-	-	8	72.7	3	27.3
33. There are high quality materials available for re-teaching activities for students not mastering a specific skill after initial presentation.	3.1	-	-	1	9.1	8	72.7	2	18.2
34. Teachers spend less time in the recordkeeping process in mastery learning than in a conventional classroom.	2.7	1	10.0	2	20.0	6	60.0	1	10.0
35. The administration in the district is supportive of the mastery learning program.	3.5	-	-	-	-	6	54.5	5	45.5
36. The mastery learning program in this school district has been effectively and efficiently implemented.	3.7	-	-	-	-	3	27.3	8	72.7
37. Regular meetings are conducted to plan and keep people informed in regard to the project.	3.3	-	-	-	-	8	72.7	3	27.3

*High mean response indicates an unfavorable finding.

Table 2.43

WHEATON: TEACHER SURVEY - INSERVICE DATA

N = 12

Inservice Training	N	%*
Developing objectives	4	33.3%
Writing test items	3	25.0
Computer management system	9	75.0
Mastery learning program goals, objectives, definition	8	66.7
Instructional techniques/strategies related to reading.	5	41.7
Correctives development and/or use	7	58.3
Extensions development and/or use	6	50.0
Mastery learning programs in other districts	6	50.0
Correlating resources to objectives	4	33.3

*Percentages do not add to 100% due to multiple responses.

2.6 STAPLES

2.6.1 Parent Survey

Demographic data obtained from the 203 Staples respondents is presented in Table 2.44. Two-thirds of the parents listed their educational level as "high school diploma."

The involvement of Staples parents in various aspects of the school reading program is reported in Table 2.45. Their participation is generally below average as compared to the full-sample percentages. The highest levels of parental involvement were in working with their child to complete homework assignments and attending conferences with their child's reading teacher; over 75% of responding parents participated in each of their activities.

Almost 40% of parents do not agree that they are more involved with their child's reading program since implementation of the mastery learning program (Item 6). Sixty percent disagree that they have more contact with their child's teachers as a result of the program (Item 10). Overall, Staples parents responded positively to all but one of the opinion items, as shown in Table 2.46.

Highest mean responses of 3.4 were for Items 23 and 24. Besides these items, seven more items met with more than 90% agreement by the Staples respondents. This indicates that these parents believe their children enjoy reading and read regularly. They read to their children and talk with them about their reading at home and at school, and carefully follow their children's reading progress.

2.6.2 Student Survey

Tables 2.47 and 2.48 give the grade distribution and survey results for the 295 Staples primary school children. Over 85% of students responded favorably to Items 1, 8, 14, 16, and 17, indicating that a high percentage of Staples students like to read, know what to do and what to work on in reading class, believe reading well is important, and think there are not an excessive number of tests in reading class.

No survey item received a majority of unfavorable responses. However, the Staples sample had the lowest percentage of favorable responses to these items: "I like to read" (79.7% yes), "I read at home" (77.6% yes), and "Reading well is important" (93.1% yes), findings which may suggest some corrective action.

2.6.3 Teacher Survey

Seventeen Staples teachers completed the survey; Table 2.49 shows their distribution by grade level(s) of instruction.

Table 2.50 provides demographic data. Just over half of these teachers had ten or fewer years teaching experience. All of the

Table 2.44

STAPLES: PARENT SURVEY - DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

N = 203

	Level of Formal Education									
	8th Grade or Less		HS Diploma		College		Masters		Ph.D.	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Mother	11	5.6%	134	68.7%	46	23.6%	4	2.1%	-	-%
Father	5	2.7	118	63.8	51	27.6	9	4.9	2	1.1

Number of Children in School	N	%
1	45	22.8%
2	80	40.6
3	47	23.9
4	18	9.1
5	4	2.0
6+	3	1.5

Table 2.45

STAPLES: PARENT SURVEY

INVOLVEMENT WITH SCHOOL READING PROGRAM

N = 203

Involvement	N	%*
Work with my child to complete homework assignments.	162	79.8%
Attend conferences with my child's reading teacher.	171	84.2
Attend meetings or workshops related to the mastery learning reading program.	13	6.4
Observe children during reading instruction.	35	17.2
Supervise students at school while they work on assignments.	24	11.8
Help to develop or organize curriculum/resource materials.	6	3.0
Work as a volunteer aide.	29	14.3
Work as a paid instructional aide.	5	2.5
Provide classroom instruction.	8	3.9
Provide input in decision making and policy.	7	3.4
Participate through a Parent Advisory Committee.	5	2.5

*Percentages do not add to 100% due to multiple responses.

Table 2.46

STAPLES: PARENT OPINIONS

N = 203

		Scale							
	Mean	Strongly Disagree (1)		Disagree (2)		Agree (3)		Strongly Agree (4)	
Item	Response	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
* 1. It is easy for me to follow my child's progress in reading.	3.1	1	0.5%	15	7.9%	131	69.3%	42	22.2%
* 2. Reports produced through the computer management system were discussed during parent-teacher conferences.	3.2	4	2.3	12	6.8	105	59.3	56	31.6
3. I am regularly informed of the number and percentage of objectives my child attains in reading.	3.1	4	2.1	16	8.5	126	67.0	42	22.3
4. I am in regular contact with my child's teacher/teachers about his/her reading.	3.0	2	1.1	27	15.4	113	64.6	33	18.9
5. Materials are made available that I can use at home to help my child read.	2.9	4	2.4	38	22.4	106	62.4	22	12.9
6. Since the mastery learning program was started, I feel more involved in my child's reading.	2.7	6	3.6	60	35.7	80	47.6	22	13.1
* 7. I read stories to my child at home.	3.3	1	0.5	7	3.7	114	60.6	66	35.1
* 8. I talk with my child about the stories we read.	3.2	1	0.5	10	5.3	123	64.7	56	29.5
9. I encourage my children to make up their own stories.	3.0	2	1.1	34	18.8	115	63.5	30	16.6
10. I have more contact with my child's teacher/teachers since the mastery learning program was implemented.	2.4	6	3.7	90	56.6	57	35.2	9	5.6

*High mean response indicates an unfavorable finding.

-73-

Table 2.46 - (cont'd)

STAPLES: PARENT OPINIONS

N = 203

		Scale							
Item	Mean Response	Strongly Disagree (1)		Disagree (2)		Agree (3)		Strongly Agree (4)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
11. Someone at the school has explained why my child was placed at their current level in reading.	3.1	-	-%	21	11.5%	120	65.6%	42	23.0%
12. I understand how reading is taught in the mastery learning reading program.	2.8	9	5.0	43	23.9	104	57.8	24	11.8
13. Reports produced through the computer management system make it easier to monitor my child's progress in reading.	2.9	6	3.4	36	20.2	101	56.7	35	19.7
*14. I carefully follow my child's progress in reading.	3.2	-	-	11	5.9	134	71.3	43	22.9
15. Through the computer management reports, I have become more aware of my child's reading skills.	2.9	7	3.8	44	24.2	93	51.1	38	20.9
16. If my child masters all the objectives identified in the computer management report, then the instructional program is appropriate.	2.9	5	3.1	28	17.5	99	61.9	28	17.5
*17. An objective of the reading program at our school is to stimulate a desire to read on the part of every child.	3.3	-	-	5	2.8	112	62.9	61	34.3
*18. I talk with my child about his/her reading assignments.	3.1	-	-	13	7.0	141	76.2	31	16.8
19. If my child is not reading at a level I find acceptable, I increase the amount of time my child works on reading at home.	2.8	4	2.5	40	25.3	93	58.9	21	13.3
20. I limit the amount of time my child spends watching TV.	3.1	2	1.1	19	10.3	121	65.4	43	23.2

*High mean response indicates an unfavorable finding.

-74-

Table 2.46 - (cont'd)

STAPLES: PARENT OPINIONS

N = 203

		Scale							
		Strongly Disagree (1)		Disagree (2)		Agree (3)		Strongly Agree (4)	
Item	Mean Response	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
21. Teachers know what interests my child.	3.0	-	-%	19	10.7%	132	74.6%	26	14.7%
22. Reading instruction in our school has been significantly improved through adoption of the mastery learning approach.	3.1	-	-	19	13.8	93	67.4	26	18.8
*23. My child enjoys reading.	3.4	1	0.5	7	3.6	99	51.0	87	44.8
*24. My child reads library books on a regular basis.	3.4	1	0.5	12	6.3	92	47.9	87	45.3

*High mean response indicates an unfavorable finding.

Table 2.47

STAPLES: STUDENT SURVEY - GRADE LEVEL OF RESPONDENTS

N = 295

Grade	N	%
1	93	31.6%
2	95	32.3
3	106	36.1

Table 2.48

STAPLES: STUDENT SURVEY

N = 295

Item	Yes N	Yes %	In Between N	In Between %	No N	No %
1. I like to read.	266	90.2%	4	1.4%	25	8.5%
2. I read well.	236	79.7	3	1.0	57	19.3
3. I read at home.	229	77.6	1	0.3	65	22.0
4. In reading class, someone is always there to help me.	244	82.2	5	1.7	48	16.2
* 5. My reading class is too hard.	43	14.6	6	2.0	245	83.3
6. My reading class is fun.	242	82.3	2	0.7	50	17.0
7. I know how well I am doing in reading.	207	70.4	2	0.7	85	28.9
* 8. There are too many tests in my reading class.	43	14.6	1	0.3	251	85.1
* 9. My reading class is boring.	74	25.3	2	0.7	216	74.0
10. I know how well other students can read.	209	70.8	1	0.3	85	28.8
11. My friends all read well.	182	61.5	3	1.0	111	37.5
*12. I avoid students who don't read well.	61	20.7	3	1.0	230	78.2
*13. My reading class is too easy.	127	43.1	3	1.0	165	55.9
14. I know what I am supposed to do in my reading class.	268	90.2	1	0.3	28	9.4
15. I read library books more often than last year.	215	72.6	1	0.3	80	27.0
16. I know what I need to work on in reading.	264	88.9	1	0.3	32	10.8
17. Reading well is important.	269	93.1	2	0.7	18	6.2

*High percentage of "yes" responses indicates an unfavorable finding.

Table 2.49
STAPLES: TEACHER SURVEY - GRADE LEVEL PRESENTLY TEACHING
N = 17

Grade	N	%
1	3	21.4%
2	3	21.4
3	4	28.6
K-6	2	14.3
1-3	2	14.3

Table 2.50
STAPLES: TEACHER SURVEY - DEMOGRAPHIC DATA
N = 17

Number Of Years	Years Experience As Teacher		Years In District		Years In Grade		Years Teaching Reading		Years Experience With Differentiated Staffing		Years Experience With Mastery Learning	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1 - 5	4	23.5%	7	41.2%	9	52.9%	5	29.4%	3	17.6%	16	94.1%
6 - 10	5	29.4	5	29.4	3	17.6	6	35.3	1	5.9	-	-
11 - 15	1	5.9	-	-	1	5.9	-	-	-	-	-	-
16 - 20	3	17.6	5	29.5	2	11.8	3	17.6	-	-	-	-
21+	4	23.6	-	-	1	5.9	3	17.6	-	-	-	-
0 or Blank	-	-	-	-	1	5.9	-	-	13	76.5	1	5.9

Highest Degree Earned	N	%
Bachelors	14	82.4%
Masters	3	17.6

Major	N	%
Elementary Education	13	76.5%
Special Education	2	11.8
Blank	2	11.8

teachers responding indicated that they had just one year of experience with mastery learning. Despite Staples' designation as a differentiated staffing site, most of these teachers did not report prior experience with differentiated staffing.

This group of teachers gave favorable responses to nearly all items (see Table 2.51). Respondents were in complete agreement with ten of the items (1, 3, 5, 8, 12, 14, 25, 27, 29, and 35). They also disagreed in consensus with Items 15 and 28. These responses reflect an overall positive attitude of teachers toward the mastery learning program in Staples. These teachers agree with establishing measurable objectives for teaching reading skills based upon each individual child's skill level. They are pleased with the computer management system's monitoring of student reading progress, and report that it frees them to give more time to classroom instruction. They agree that mastery learning instructional practices can be applied to other areas of learning. They view the Staples administration as supportive of the mastery learning program. Items 10 and 28 show that the Staples teachers feel the mastery learning program takes no more time and work in teacher preparation than other methods of teaching.

The only items receiving unfavorable overall responses based on mean responses or a majority of unfavorable responses are Items 7, 31, and 33. The majority of teachers felt that the mastery learning program did not result in smaller reading groups. Teachers also reported a lack of high-quality enrichment/extension and corrective materials.

The majority of Staples teachers have received training in four aspects of mastery learning listed in Table 2.52. All but one teacher had training in the mastery learning program goals, objectives, and definition. Twelve have learned about mastery learning programs in other districts, ten received training in the computer management system, and nine teachers were trained in instructional techniques/ strategies related to reading.

Table 2.51

STAPLES: TEACHER OPINIONS

N = 17

Item	Mean Response	Scale							
		Strongly Disagree (1)		Disagree (2)		Agree (3)		Strongly Agree (4)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. At our school, important reading skills have been stated as measurable objectives.	3.6	-	-%	-	-%	8	47.1%	9	52.9%
2. Objectives proposed for inclusion in our reading program were critically evaluated.	3.2	-	-	2	11.8	10	58.8	5	29.4
3. Objectives should be identified before the students interact with the curriculum.	3.4	-	-	-	-	11	64.7	6	35.3
4. Sufficient time was devoted to the identification of measurable objectives.	2.9	-	-	2	11.8	14	82.4	1	5.9
5. An initial assessment of the child's skill level is essential.	3.6	-	-	-	-	7	41.2	10	58.8
6. The diagnostic tests used in the initial placement of students were effective.	3.0	-	-	2	12.5	12	75.0	2	12.5
7. Use of the mastery learning program has resulted in smaller reading groups.	2.3	2	14.3	6	42.9	6	42.9	-	-
8. The computer management system reports provide excellent feedback for teachers.	3.8	-	-	-	-	4	23.5	13	76.5
9. Correctives and extensions are in place before students begin specific units.	3.2	-	-	1	7.7	9	69.2	3	23.1
*10. Mastery learning requires more time in teacher preparation than other ways of teaching.	2.0	1	7.1	12	85.7	1	7.1	-	-

*High mean response indicates an unfavorable finding.

Table 2.51 - (cont'd)

STAPLES: TEACHER OPINIONS

N = 17

		Scale							
		Strongly Disagree (1)		Disagree (2)		Agree (3)		Strongly Agree (4)	
Item	Mean Response	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
*11. There is a shortage of appropriate resources for students who fail to reach the criterion after an initial presentation of the lesson.	2.4	1	5.9%	9	52.9%	6	35.3%	1	5.9%
12. Reports produced through the computer management system make it easy to monitor student progress in reading.	3.6	-	-	-	-	7	41.2	10	58.8
13. Since parents can readily follow their child's progress in reading, I can focus on other important issues during parent-teacher conferences.	2.9	-	-	4	26.7	9	60.0	2	13.3
14. Since our school adopted the computer management system, teachers can devote more time in classroom instruction.	3.2	-	-	-	-	12	80.0	3	20.0
*15. The computer management system detracts from the teaching of reading.	1.5	7	46.7	8	53.3	-	-	-	-
16. Clear guidelines have been established for matching assessment information with alternative teaching strategies.	2.8	1	6.3	3	18.8	10	62.5	2	12.5
17. The computer management system reports provide excellent feedback for parents.	3.2	1	5.9	1	5.9	8	47.1	7	41.2
18. A common commitment by the Board, administration, and teachers to the mastery learning program has helped to ensure its success.	3.1	-	-	1	6.3	12	75.0	3	18.8
*19. The usefulness of the mastery learning program varies depending on the child's ability.	2.5	-	-	11	64.7	4	23.5	2	11.8

*High mean response indicates an unfavorable finding.

Table 2.51 - (cont'd)

STAPLES: TEACHER OPINIONS

N = 17

Item	Mean Response	Scale							
		Strongly Disagree (1)		Disagree (2)		Agree (3)		Strongly Agree (4)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
20. Reading instruction in our school has been significantly improved through adoption of the mastery learning approach.	3.0	-	-%	2	14.3%	10	71.4%	2	14.3%
21. I can document positive change in the reading ability of students since the mastery learning program was adopted.	3.9	-	-	1	8.3	11	91.7	-	-
22. The computer management system has helped to individualize instruction.	3.0	-	-	3	17.6	11	64.7	3	17.6
23. I experience more satisfaction in my job as a teacher since the mastery learning program was adopted.	3.0	-	-	2	15.4	9	69.2	2	15.4
24. I feel more confident in my ability to teach reading since the mastery learning program was adopted.	3.1	-	-	1	8.3	9	75.0	2	16.7
25. Most teachers like the computer management system.	3.3	-	-	-	-	11	68.8	5	31.3
26. The mastery learning approach has broadened my definition of what it means to teach reading.	2.6	-	-	6	42.9	7	50.0	1	7.1
27. Clearly defined objectives ensure that the same curriculum is adopted by all elementary grade reading teachers.	3.1	-	-	-	-	16	94.1	1	5.9
*28. Work and time requirements involved in curriculum development, make mastery learning unfeasible in the long run.	1.7	4	28.6	10	71.4	-	-	-	-
29. The instructional practices utilized in mastery learning can be used to improve instruction in areas of learning other than reading.	3.1	-	-	-	-	14	87.5	2	12.5

*High mean response indicates an unfavorable finding.

Table 2.51 - (cont'd)

STAPLES: TEACHER OPINIONS

N = 17

Item	Mean Response	Scale							
		Strongly Disagree (1)		Disagree (2)		Agree (3)		Strongly Agree (4)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
30. Inservice related to the mastery learning program has improved my skills in teaching reading.	2.9	-	-%	3	21.4%	10	71.4%	1	7.1%
31. High quality materials for enrichment and extension activities are provided for students who have demonstrated a mastery of a specific skill.	2.4	-	-	10	66.7	4	26.7	1	6.7
32. The computer management system reports provide excellent feedback for students.	3.2	-	-	2	11.8	9	52.9	6	35.3
33. There are high quality materials available for re-teaching activities for students not mastering a specific skill after initial presentation.	2.5	1	5.9	8	47.1	7	41.2	1	5.9
34. Teachers spend less time in the recordkeeping process in mastery learning than in a conventional classroom.	3.3	-	-	1	6.3	10	62.5	5	31.3
35. The administration in the district is supportive of the mastery learning program.	3.3	-	-	-	-	12	75.0	4	25.0
36. The mastery learning program in this school district has been effectively and efficiently implemented.	3.0	-	-	2	11.8	13	76.5	2	11.8
37. Regular meetings are conducted to plan and keep people informed in regard to the project.	2.9	-	-	2	14.3	11	78.6	1	7.1

*High mean response indicates an unfavorable finding.

Table 2.52

STAPLES: TEACHER SURVEY - INSERVICE DATA

N = 17

Inservice Training	N	%*
Developing objectives	6	35.3%
Writing test items	-	-
Computer management system	10	58.8
Mastery learning program goals, objectives, definition	16	94.1
Instructional techniques/strategies related to reading	9	52.9
Correctives development and/or use	4	23.5
Extensions development and/or use	2	11.8
Mastery learning programs in other districts	12	70.6
Correlating resources to objectives	3	17.6

*Percentages do not add to 100% due to multiple responses.

2.7 ST. CLOUD

2.7.1 Parent Survey

Demographic data obtained from 159 St. Cloud respondents is presented in Table 2.53. About 45% of the parents have had post-secondary education.

Table 2.54 shows the involvement of St. Cloud parents in various aspects of the school reading program. Most of the parents responding indicated that they work with their child to complete homework assignments (92.5%) and that they attend conferences with their child's reading teacher (85.5%). One-third of these parents also attend meetings or workshops related to the mastery learning reading program.

Responses to the opinion items are reported in Table 2.55. Overall, St. Cloud parents agreed with all but one opinion item; most items had means of 3.0 or above. However, over half of these parents disagreed with Item 10, indicating that they have not had more contact with their child's teachers since the mastery learning program was implemented.

Items 1, 7, 8, 14, 17, 18, 22, and 23 received "agree" or "strongly agree" ratings from over 90% of the St. Cloud parents. These parents find it easy to follow their child's progress in reading. They read stories to their children, and discuss these stories and their child's reading assignments with them. They carefully follow their child's progress in reading. They agree that one objective of the reading program in their school is to stimulate a desire to read on the part of every child and that the mastery learning program has significantly improved reading instruction. They report that their child enjoys reading.

2.7.2 Student Survey

A total of 344 St. Cloud students completed the survey, including an almost equal number of first, second, and third graders, as shown in Table 2.56.

Only one survey item received a majority of unfavorable responses: 52.4% of the students said "My reading class is too easy." This result is similar to the response to this item by students in other districts. Although the other items were answered favorably by the majority of the students, the percentages were generally lower than for other schools and may in some cases be cause for concern. For example, ten percent of the students report that they do not like to read, and twenty percent or more say they do not read at home, they don't always have help available in reading class, and think reading class is boring. The survey items receiving better than 85% favorable responses are "I like to read," "I read well," "I know what I am supposed to do in reading class," and "Reading well is important," as shown in Table 2.57.

Table 2.53

ST. CLOUD: PARENT SURVEY - DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

N = 159

	Level of Formal Education									
	8th Grade or Less		HS Diploma		College		Masters		Ph.D.	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Mother	1	0.6%	89	57.4%	52	33.5%	13	8.4%	–	–%
Father	1	0.7	74	50.3	47	32.0	15	10.2	10	6.8

Number of Children in School	N	%
1	48	31.2%
2	71	46.2
3	27	17.5
4	7	4.5
5	1	0.6
6+	–	–

Table 2.54

ST. CLOUD: PARENT SURVEY

INVOLVEMENT WITH SCHOOL READING PROGRAM

N = 159

Involvement	N	%*
Work with my child to complete homework assignments.	147	92.5%
Attend conferences with my child's reading teacher.	136	85.5
Attend meetings or workshops related to the mastery learning reading program.	57	35.8
Observe children during reading instruction.	32	20.1
Supervise students at school while they work on assignments.	17	10.7
Help to develop or organize curriculum/resource materials.	6	3.8
Work as a volunteer aide.	18	11.3
Work as a paid instructional aide.	3	1.9
Provide classroom instruction.	4	2.5
Provide input in decision making and policy.	6	3.8
Participate through a Parent Advisory Committee.	8	5.0

*Percentages do not add to 100% due to multiple responses.

Table 2.55

ST. CLOUD: PARENT OPINIONS

N = 159

Item	Mean Response	Strongly Disagree (1)		Disagree (2)		Agree (3)		Strongly Agree (4)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. It is easy for me to follow my child's progress in reading.	3.3	-	-%	10	6.4%	96	61.5%	50	32.1%
2. Reports produced through the computer management system were discussed during parent-teacher conferences.	3.0	6	4.8	21	16.9	60	48.4	37	29.8
3. I am regularly informed of the number and percentage of objectives my child attains in reading.	3.0	3	2.0	29	19.7	78	53.1	37	25.2
4. I am in regular contact with my child's teacher/teachers about his/her reading.	2.9	3	2.0	33	21.7	86	56.6	30	19.7
5. Materials are made available that I can use at home to help my child read.	3.0	4	2.8	31	21.4	70	48.3	40	27.6
6. Since the mastery learning program was started, I feel more involved in my child's reading.	2.9	3	2.1	49	34.0	57	39.6	35	24.3
7. I read stories to my child at home.	3.4	1	0.6	8	5.2	76	49.4	69	44.8
8. I talk with my child about the stories we read.	3.2	1	0.7	10	6.6	93	61.2	48	31.6
9. I encourage my children to make up their own stories.	3.1	1	0.7	20	13.3	93	62.0	36	24.0
10. I have more contact with my child's teacher/teachers since the mastery learning program was implemented.	2.4	7	5.1	78	56.5	40	29.0	13	9.4
11. Someone at the school has explained why my child was placed at their current level in reading.	3.1	1	0.7	22	14.6	94	62.3	34	22.5
12. I understand how reading is taught in the mastery learning reading program.	3.0	-	-	29	19.2	95	62.9	27	17.9

Table 2.55 - (cont'd)

ST. CLOUD: PARENT OPINIONS

N = 159

		Scale							
		Strongly Disagree (1)		Disagree (2)		Agree (3)		Strongly Agree (4)	
Item	Mean Response	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
13. Reports produced through the computer management system make it easier to monitor my child's progress in reading.	2.9	2	1.7%	24	20.9%	75	65.2%	14	12.2%
14. I carefully follow my child's progress in reading.	3.2	-	-	15	9.8	93	60.8	45	29.4
15. Through the computer management reports, I have become more aware of my child's reading skills.	2.8	2	1.7	32	26.9	69	58.0	16	13.4
16. If my child masters all the objectives identified in the computer management report, then the instructional program is appropriate.	3.0	3	2.6	13	11.2	80	69.0	20	17.2
17. An objective of the reading program at our school is to stimulate a desire to read on the part of every child.	3.3	-	-	3	2.1	91	62.3	52	35.6
18. I talk with my child about his/her reading assignments.	3.2	-	-	10	6.5	97	63.4	46	30.1
19. If my child is not reading at a level I find acceptable, I increase the amount of time my child works on reading at home.	2.8	4	3.1	39	30.0	72	55.4	15	11.5
20. I limit the amount of time my child spends watching TV.	3.1	2	1.3	19	12.3	92	59.4	42	27.1
21. Teachers know what interests my child.	3.1	2	1.4	14	9.7	92	63.4	37	25.5
22. Reading instruction in our school has been significantly improved through adoption of the mastery learning approach.	3.3	1	0.8	6	5.0	74	61.2	40	33.1
23. My child enjoys reading.	3.4	2	1.3	10	6.4	61	38.9	84	53.5
24. My child reads library books on a regular basis.	3.3	2	1.3	18	11.8	59	38.8	73	48.0

Table 2.56

ST. CLOUD: STUDENT SURVEY - GRADE LEVEL OF RESPONDENTS

N = 344

Grade	N	%
1	118	34.5%
2	111	32.5
3	109	31.9
Other	4	1.2

Table 2.57

ST. CLOUD: STUDENT SURVEY

N = 344

Item	Yes N	Yes %	In Between N	In Between %	No N	No %
1. I like to read.	308	89.5%	-	-%	36	10.5%
2. I read well.	309	89.8	-	-	35	10.2
3. I read at home.	275	79.9	-	-	69	20.1
4. In reading class, someone is always there to help me.	275	79.9	-	-	69	20.1
* 5. My reading class is too hard.	44	12.8	-	-	299	87.2
6. My reading class is fun.	287	84.4	-	-	53	15.6
7. I know how well I am doing in reading.	231	68.1	-	-	108	31.9
* 8. There are too many tests in my reading class.	71	20.7	-	-	272	79.3
* 9. My reading class is boring.	82	24.0	-	-	260	76.0
10. I know how well other students can read.	184	53.6	-	-	159	46.4
11. My friends all read well.	245	72.1	-	-	95	27.9
*12. I avoid students who don't read well.	90	26.2	-	-	253	73.8
*13. My reading class is too easy.	177	52.4	-	-	161	47.6
14. I know what I am supposed to do in my reading class.	311	91.5	-	-	29	8.5
15. I read library books more often than last year.	258	75.2	-	-	85	24.8
16. I know what I need to work on in reading.	289	84.8	-	-	52	15.2
17. Reading well is important.	323	97.0	-	-	10	3.0

*High percentage of "yes" responses indicates an unfavorable finding.

2.7.3 Teacher Survey

The teacher survey was administered to 36 St. Cloud teachers of grades 1-4, as shown in Table 2.58.

Table 2.59 provides demographic data. These St. Cloud teachers were nearly evenly distributed in their years of teaching experience, averaging 11.5 years of teaching. Thirty-five of the 36 teachers indicated that they have just one year of experience with mastery learning.

Eight of the multiple-choice items received overall unfavorable responses based on the mean response and/or a majority of unfavorable responses, namely Items 7, 9, 10, 11, 13. 31, 33, and 34 (see Table 2.60). These items show shortcomings in these areas: the size of reading groups; the teacher time required in preparation; record-keeping, and parent-teacher conferences; and extension and corrective materials of sufficient quantity and quality. The unfavorable response to Item 34, plus the lower number of respondents to the survey items pertaining to the computer management system, reflect the incomplete implementation of the computer management system in the St. Cloud schools.

Nonetheless, several items received unanimous favorable responses while others are highly favorable. These items pertain to implementing measurable, critically evaluated objectives, methods for initial placement of students, and support of district administration for the program. Most St. Cloud teachers feel that the mastery learning program has enhanced reading instruction in their school and has enhanced their job satisfaction (Items 20, 21, 23, 24). The computer management system items received highly favorable ratings from respondents, although many teachers marked these items "not applicable."

Table 2.61 indicates what classes, workshops, and inservice training St. Cloud teachers have been involved in related to mastery learning. A majority of the respondents have received training in mastery learning program goals, objectives, and definition; developing objectives; writing test items; and extensions development and/or use. Only two of the 36 respondents reported involvement in computer management system training.

Table 2.58

ST. CLOUD: TEACHER SURVEY - GRADE LEVEL PRESENTLY TEACHING

N = 36

Grade	N	%
1	10	32.3%
2	7	22.6
3	7	22.6
4	7	22.6

Table 2.59

ST. CLOUD: TEACHER SURVEY - DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

N = 36

Number Of Years	Years Experience As Teacher		Years In District		Years In Grade		Years Teaching Reading		Years Experience With Differentiated Staffing		Years Experience With Mastery Learning	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1 - 5	9	25.0%	13	36.1%	24	66.7%	9	25.0%	7	19.4%	35	97.2%
6 - 10	8	22.3	6	16.8	6	16.7	9	25.1	4	11.1	-	-
11 - 15	8	22.3	7	19.5	2	5.6	8	22.3	3	8.3	-	-
16 - 20	6	16.8	8	22.3	3	8.4	6	16.8	-	-	-	-
21+	5	13.9	2	5.6	1	2.8	4	11.1	-	-	-	-
0 or Blank	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	22	61.1	1	2.8

Highest Degree Earned	N	%
Bachelors	27	75.0%
Masters	6	16.7
Blank	3	8.3

Major	N	%
Elementary Education	32	88.9%
Reading	4	11.1
Blank	-	-

Table 2.60

ST. CLOUD: TEACHER OPINIONS

N = 36

| | | Scale | | | | | | | |
| | | Strongly Disagree (1) | | Disagree (2) | | Agree (3) | | Strongly Agree (4) | |
Item	Mean Response	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. At our school, important reading skills have been stated as measurable objectives.	3.8	-	-%	-	-%	7	19.4%	29	80.6%
2. Objectives proposed for inclusion in our reading program were critically evaluated.	3.6	-	-	-	-	14	38.9	22	61.1
3. Objectives should be identified before the students interact with the curriculum.	3.9	-	-	1	2.8	3	8.3	32	88.9
4. Sufficient time was devoted to the identification of measurable objectives.	3.4	-	-	1	2.8	21	58.3	14	38.9
5. An initial assessment of the child's skill level is essential.	3.5	-	-	2	5.7	15	42.9	18	51.4
6. The diagnostic tests used in the initial placement of students were effective.	3.2	-	-	1	7.7	9	69.2	3	23.1
7. Use of the mastery learning program has resulted in smaller reading groups.	1.8	12	36.4	18	54.5	1	3.0	2	6.1
8. The computer management system reports provide excellent feedback for teachers.	3.5	-	-	1	4.8	9	42.9	11	52.4
9. Correctives and extensions are in place before students begin specific units.	2.3	4	11.8	15	44.1	15	44.1	-	-
*10. Mastery learning requires more time in teacher preparation than other ways of teaching.	2.6	2	5.9	12	35.3	16	47.1	4	11.8

*High mean response indicates an unfavorable finding.

Table 2.60 - (cont'd)

ST. CLOUD: TEACHER OPINIONS

N = 36

Item	Mean Response	Scale							
		Strongly Disagree (1)		Disagree (2)		Agree (3)		Strongly Agree (4)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
*11. There is a shortage of appropriate resources for students who fail to reach the criterion after an initial presentation of the lesson.	2.7	-	-%	12	34.3%	22	62.9%	1	2.9%
12. Reports produced through the computer management system make it easy to monitor student progress in reading.	3.2	-	-	3	14.3	11	52.4	7	33.3
13. Since parents can readily follow their child's progress in reading, I can focus on other important issues during parent-teacher conferences.	2.6	-	-	17	51.5	11	33.3	5	15.2
14. Since our school adopted the computer management system, teachers can devote more time in classroom instruction.	2.7	-	-	9	42.9	9	42.9	4	14.3
*15. The computer management system detracts from the teaching of reading.	1.8	5	22.7	16	72.7	1	4.5	-	-
16. Clear guidelines have been established for matching assessment information with alternative teaching strategies.	2.5	2	6.3	14	43.8	13	40.6	3	9.4
17. The computer management system reports provide excellent feedback for parents.	3.4	-	-	-	-	13	61.9	4	38.1
18. A common commitment by the Board, administration, and teachers to the mastery learning program has helped to ensure its success.	3.3	-	-	-	-	24	68.6	11	31.4
*19. The usefulness of the mastery learning program varies depending on the child's ability.	2.2	6	16.7	19	52.8	10	27.8	1	2.8

*High mean response indicates an unfavorable finding.

Table 2.60 - (cont'd)

ST. CLOUD: TEACHER OPINIONS

N = 36

		Scale							
	Mean	Strongly Disagree (1)		Disagree (2)		Agree (3)		Strongly Agree (4)	
Item	Response	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
20. Reading instruction in our school has been significantly improved through adoption of the mastery learning approach.	3.2	-	-%	4	11.8%	19	55.9%	11	32.4%
21. I can document positive change in the reading ability of students since the mastery learning program was adopted.	3.0	-	-	7	20.6	19	55.9	8	23.5
22. The computer management system has helped to individualize instruction.	2.9	1	5.0	3	15.0	13	65.0	3	15.0
23. I experience more satisfaction in my job as a teacher since the mastery learning program was adopted.	2.9	-	-	10	28.6	18	51.4	7	20.0
24. I feel more confident in my ability to teach reading since the mastery learning program was adopted.	2.8	2	5.6	11	30.6	17	47.2	6	16.7
25. Most teachers like the computer management system.	3.1	-	-	1	4.5	17	77.3	4	18.2
26. The mastery learning approach has broadened my definition of what it means to teach reading.	3.1	-	-	3	8.6	26	74.3	6	17.1
27. Clearly defined objectives ensure that the same curriculum is adopted by all elementary grade reading teachers.	3.2	-	-	1	2.9	24	70.6	9	26.5
*28. Work and time requirements involved in curriculum development, make mastery learning unfeasible in the long run.	1.9	7	19.4	26	72.2	1	2.8	2	5.6
29. The instructional practices utilized in mastery learning can be used to improve instruction in areas of learning other than reading.	3.2	-	-	-	-	27	77.1	8	22.9

*High mean response indicates an unfavorable finding.

Table 2.60 - (cont'd)

ST. CLOUD: TEACHER OPINIONS

N = 36

			Scale						
		Strongly Disagree (1)		Disagree (2)		Agree (3)		Strongly Agree (4)	
Item	Mean Response	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
30. Inservice related to the mastery learning program has improved my skills in teaching reading.	2.8	1	3.2%	9	29.0%	16	51.6%	5	16.1%
31. High quality materials for enrichment and extension activities are provided for students who have demonstrated a mastery of a specific skill.	2.3	4	11.1	17	47.2	14	38.9	1	2.8
32. The computer management system reports provide excellent feedback for students.	3.2	-	-	2	13.3	8	53.3	5	33.3
33. There are high quality materials available for re-teaching activities for students not mastering a specific skill after initial presentation.	2.4	2	5.6	20	55.6	12	33.3	2	5.6
34. Teachers spend less time in the recordkeeping process in mastery learning than in a conventional classroom.	1.9	8	22.9	23	65.7	4	11.4	-	-
35. The administration in the district is supportive of the mastery learning program.	3.3	-	-	-	-	27	75.0	9	25.0
36. The mastery learning program in this school district has been effectively and efficiently implemented.	3.1	-	-	3	8.3	25	69.4	8	22.2
37. Regular meetings are conducted to plan and keep people informed in regard to the project.	2.9	-	-	8	22.2	22	61.1	6	16.7

*High mean response indicates an unfavorable finding.

Table 2.61

ST. CLOUD: TEACHER SURVEY - INSERVICE DATA

N = 36

Inservice Training	N	%*
Developing objectives	21	58.3%
Writing test items	22	61.1
Computer management system	2	5.6
Mastery learning program goals, objectives, definition	29	80.6
Instructional techniques/strategies related to reading	9	25.0
Correctives development and/or use	17	47.2
Extensions development and/or use	19	52.8
Mastery learning programs in other districts	3	8.3
Correlating resources to objectives	7	19.4

*Percentages do not add to 100% due to multiple responses.

2.8 MONTEVIDEO

2.8.1 Parent Survey

Table 2.62 presents the demographic data obtained from the
317 Montevideo respondents. Parental involvement in various
aspects of the school reading program is reported in Table 2.63.
Over ninety percent of parents responding indicated that they work
with their child to complete homework assignments. Three-fourths
also attend conferences with their child's reading teacher. Of
all the demonstration sites, Montevideo had the highest percentage
of parents who "supervise students at school while they work on
assignments" (30.9%) and "work as a volunteer aide" (35.3%), based
on survey responses.

Responses to the opinion items are contained in Table 2.64.
Overall, Montevideo parents responded positively to these items, with
most means exceeding 3.0. However, 57.4% of parents disagreed with
Item 10, indicating that they have not had more contact with their
child's teachers since the mastery learning program was implemented.

Over 90% of responding parents agreed to Items 1, 7, 8, 14, 17,
18, 23, and 24. These parents agreed that they can easily follow their
child's reading progress, and do so carefully. They encourage their
children's interest by reading to them and discussing stories and
reading assignments with them. They agree that their child's reading
program aims to stimulate a desire to read on the part of every child.
They believe that their child enjoys reading and reads regularly.

2.8.2 Student Survey

Table 2.65 shows a balanced distribution of first, second,
third, and fourth graders among the 509 Montevideo survey respondents.
Montevideo had the most fourth graders completing the survey; Hopkins
and Minneapolis were the only other schools with a significant number
of fourth grade respondents.

Montevideo students responded favorably to all survey items,
although they were nearly equally divided on the item "My reading
class is too easy." The Montevideo findings are quite representative
of the all-school student sample findings, and no survey items have
distinctive results. (See Table 2.66.) Nine of the 24 items received
favorable responses from over 85% of students responding (Items 1, 2,
3, 5, 6, 14, 15, 16, 17). These items are:

1. I like to read.
2. I read well.
3. I read at home.
5. My reading class is too hard. (87% say "no")
6. My reading class is fun.
14. I know what I am supposed to do in my reading class.
15. I read library books more often than last year.
16. I know what I need to work on in reading.
17. Reading well is important.

Table 2.62

MONTEVIDEO: PARENT SURVEY – DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

N = 317

| | Level of Formal Education | | | | | | | | | |
| | 8th Grade or Less | | HS Diploma | | College | | Masters | | Ph.D. | |
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Mother	3	1.0%	201	66.3%	93	30.7%	6	2.0%	–	–%
Father	8	2.7	183	60.8	93	30.9	11	3.7	6	2.0

Number of Children in School	N	%
1	72	23.7%
2	139	45.7
3	64	21.1
4	28	9.2
5	1	0.3
6+	–	–

Table 2.63

MONTEVIDEO: PARENT SURVEY

INVOLVEMENT WITH SCHOOL READING PROGRAM

N = 317

Involvement	N	%*
Work with my child to complete homework assignments.	288	90.9%
Attend conferences with my child's reading teacher.	237	74.8
Attend meetings or workshops related to the mastery learning reading program.	72	22.7
Observe children during reading instruction.	130	41.0
Supervise students at school while they work on assignments.	98	30.9
Help to develop or organize curriculum/resource materials.	16	5.0
Work as a volunteer aide.	112	35.3
Work as a paid instructional aide.	16	5.0
Provide classroom instruction.	13	4.1
Provide input in decision making and policy.	12	3.8
Participate through a Parent Advisory Committee.	12	3.8

*Percentages do not add to 100% due to multiple responses.

Table 2.64

MONTEVIDEO: PARENT OPINIONS

N = 317

		Scale							
		Strongly Disagree (1)		Disagree (2)		Agree (3)		Strongly Agree (4)	
Item	Mean Response	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. It is easy for me to follow my child's progress in reading.	3.2	1	0.3%	15	4.9%	203	66.8%	85	28.0%
2. Reports produced through the computer management system were discussed during parent-teacher conferences.	3.0	2	2.9	7	10.0	49	70.0	12	17.1
3. I am regulary informed of the number and percentage of objectives my child attains in reading.	3.0	9	3.1	42	14.3	189	64.5	53	18.1
4. I am in regular contact with my child's teacher/teachers about his/her reading.	2.8	11	3.8	72	24.7	170	58.4	38	13.1
5. Materials are made available that I can use at home to help my child read.	2.9	12	4.3	40	14.2	186	66.2	43	15.3
6. Since the mastery learning program was started, I feel more involved in my child's reading.	2.7	9	3.4	92	35.0	136	51.7	26	9.9
7. I read stories to my child at home.	3.3	-	-	18	6.0	161	53.7	121	40.3
8. I talk with my child about the stories we read.	3.3	-	-	13	4.4	181	60.9	103	34.7
9. I encourage my children to make up their own stories.	3.0	3	1.0	44	15.3	179	62.4	61	21.3
10. I have more contact with my child's teacher/teachers since the mastery learning program was implemented.	2.4	11	4.4	132	53.0	97	39.0	9	3.6
11. Someone at the school has explained why my child was placed at their current level in reading.	2.9	9	3.1	57	19.5	187	64.0	39	13.4
12. I understand how reading is taught in the mastery learning reading program.	2.9	8	2.8	58	20.2	176	61.3	45	15.7

Table 2.64 - (cont'd)

MONTEVIDEO: PARENT OPINIONS

N = 317

Item	Mean Response	Strongly Disagree (1)		Disagree (2)		Agree (3)		Strongly Agree (4)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
13. Reports produced through the computer management system make it easier to monitor my child's progress in reading.	3.0	1	1.2%	14	16.3%	59	68.6%	12	14.0%
14. I carefully follow my child's progress in reading.	3.2	-	-	18	6.1	187	63.8	88	30.0
15. Through the computer management reports, I have become more aware of my child's reading skills.	2.8	2	2.7	22	29.3	42	56.0	9	12.0
16. If my child masters all the objectives identified in the computer management report, then the instructional program is appropriate.	2.9	-	-	15	20.5	51	69.9	7	9.6
17. An objective of the reading program at our school is to stimulate a desire to read on the part of every child.	3.3	-	-	5	1.7	194	64.9	100	33.4
18. I talk with my child about his/her reading assignments.	3.2	1	0.3	13	4.3	199	66.6	86	28.8
19. If my child is not reading at a level I find acceptable, I increase the amount of time my child works on reading at home.	2.9	2	0.8	60	23.0	164	62.8	35	13.4
20. I limit the amount of time my child spends watching TV.	3.1	-	-	37	12.5	190	64.0	70	23.6
21. Teachers know what interests my child.	3.0	4	1.4	31	10.8	216	75.5	35	12.2
22. Reading instruction in our school has been significantly improved through adoption of the mastery learning approach.	3.1	4	1.7	23	9.9	159	68.2	47	20.2
23. My child enjoys reading.	3.5	1	0.3	16	5.3	129	42.6	157	51.8
24. My child reads library books on a regular basis.	3.4	-	-	20	6.8	132	44.7	143	48.5

Table 2.65

MONTEVIDEO: STUDENT SURVEY - GRADE LEVEL OF RESPONDENTS

N = 509

Grade	N	%
1	138	27.0%
2	138	27.0
3	110	21.5
4	124	24.3
Other	1	0.2

Table 2.66

MONTEVIDEO: STUDENT SURVEY

N = 509

Item	Yes N	Yes %	In Between N	In Between %	No N	No %
1. I like to read.	478	92.8%	7	1.4%	30	5.8%
2. I read well.	460	89.1	9	1.7	47	9.1
3. I read at home.	451	87.7	8	1.6	55	10.7
4. In reading class, someone is always there to help me.	368	71.5	14	2.7	133	25.8
* 5. My reading class is too hard.	57	11.1	10	1.9	447	87.0
6. My reading class is fun.	439	85.2	9	1.7	67	13.0
7. I know how well I am doing in reading.	383	74.5	3	0.6	128	24.9
* 8. There are too many tests in my reading class.	86	16.7	5	1.0	423	82.3
* 9. My reading class is boring.	105	20.3	4	0.8	407	78.9
10. I know how well other students can read.	331	64.3	4	0.8	180	35.0
11. My friends all read well.	353	69.1	11	2.2	147	28.8
*12. I avoid students who don't read well.	83	16.3	8	1.6	419	82.2
*13. My reading class is too easy.	243	47.6	12	2.3	256	50.1
14. I know what I am supposed to do in my reading class.	470	91.8	4	0.8	38	7.4
15. I read library books more often than last year.	443	86.9	2	0.4	65	12.7
16. I know what I need to work on in reading.	458	89.5	6	1.2	48	9.4
17. Reading well is important.	482	96.6	3	0.6	14	2.8

*High percentage of "yes" responses indicates an unfavorable finding.

2.8.3 Teacher Survey

The teacher survey was administered to 21 Montevideo teachers
of grades 1-4. Table 2.67 shows their distribution by grade level(s)
of instruction, while Table 2.68 provides demographic data. Over 60%
of the Montevideo teachers have taught for more than fifteen years.
These teachers are quite experienced in both the mastery learning
approach and differentiated staffing; a majority of respondents report
over 10 years experience with both techniques.

Montevideo teachers responded favorably to all but one survey
item, as shown in Table 2.69. In fact, 21 of the 37 items received
unanimous favorable responses, while six more items were only one
person short of unanimity. Items 1-5, relating to measurable
objectives and the initial assessment of students received very high
mean responses of 3.7-3.9 as most teachers expressed "strong agreement"
with these items. Teachers believe that the mastery learning program
has significantly improved reading instruction in their school and has
given them more confidence and job satisfaction. They feel that a
cooperative effort of all district personnel has enabled effective
implementation of the program in their school.

The computer management system items received high ratings, but
many teachers marked "not applicable" to these items. Items 20, 21,
23, and 24 also received many "not applicable" responses. The only
item to receive an overall unfavorable response was Item 19. The
majority of the Montevideo respondents agree that "The usefulness of
the mastery learning program varies depending on the child's ability."

All Montevideo teachers were trained in writing test items.
Half have received training in instructional techniques/strategies
related to reading and extensions development and/or use. Table 2.70
summarizes the inservice training findings.

Table 2.67

MONTEVIDEO: TEACHER SURVEY - GRADE LEVEL PRESENTLY TEACHING

N = 21

Grade	N	%
1	6	30.0%
2	5	25.0
3	4	20.0
4	4	20.0
Other	1	5.0

Table 2.68

MONTEVIDEO: TEACHER SURVEY - DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

N = 21

Number Of Years	Years Experience As Teacher		Years In District		Years In Grade		Years Teaching Reading		Years Experience With Differentiated Staffing		Years Experience With Mastery Learning	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1 - 5	3	14.3%	3	14.3%	11	52.4%	5	23.8%	5	23.8%	4	19.0%
6 - 10	1	4.8	4	19.0	4	19.0	1	4.8	3	14.3	4	19.0
11 - 15	4	19.0	5	23.8	2	9.5	3	14.3	9	42.9	9	42.9
16 - 20	7	33.4	5	23.8	3	14.3	5	23.8	2	9.5	3	14.3
21+	6	28.8	4	19.0	-	-	5	23.8	-	-	-	-
0 or Blank	-	-	-	-	1	4.8	2	9.5	2	9.5	1	4.8

Highest Degree Earned	N	%
Bachelors	16	76.2%
Masters	5	23.8

Major	N	%
Elementary Education	21	100.0%

Table 2.69

MONTEVIDEO: TEACHER OPINIONS

N = 21

		Scale							
		Strongly Disagree (1)		Disagree (2)		Agree (3)		Strongly Agree (4)	
Item	Mean Response	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. At our school, important reading skills have been stated as measurable objectives.	3.9	-	-%	-	-%	2	9.5%	19	90.5%
2. Objectives proposed for inclusion in our reading program were critically evaluated.	3.8	-	-	-	-	4	19.0	17	81.0
3. Objectives should be identified before the students interact with the curriculum.	3.7	-	-	-	-	7	33.3	14	66.7
4. Sufficient time was devoted to the identification of measurable objectives.	3.7	-	-	-	-	6	30.0	14	70.0
5. An initial assessment of the child's skill level is essential.	3.7	-	-	-	-	6	28.6	15	71.4
6. The diagnostic tests used in the initial placement of students were effective.	3.3	-	-	-	-	10	66.7	5	33.3
7. Use of the mastery learning program has resulted in smaller reading groups.	3.3	-	-	2	11.1	9	50.0	7	38.9
8. The computer management system reports provide excellent feedback for teachers.	3.8	-	-	-	-	1	16.7	5	83.3
9. Correctives and extensions are in place before students begin specific units.	3.6	-	-	-	-	9	42.9	12	57.1
*10. Mastery learning requires more time in teacher preparation than other ways of teaching.	2.3	-	-	16	76.2	4	19.0	1	4.8

*High mean response indicates an unfavorable finding.

Table 2.69 - (cont'd)

MONTEVIDEO: TEACHER OPINIONS

N = 21

Item	Mean Response	Scale							
		Strongly Disagree (1)		Disagree (2)		Agree (3)		Strongly Agree (4)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
*11. There is a shortage of appropriate resources for students who fail to reach the criterion after an initial presentation of the lesson.	2.1	3	14.3%	15	71.4%	-	-%	3	14.3%
12. Reports produced through the computer management system make it easy to monitor student progress in reading.	3.8	-	-	-	-	1	16.7	5	83.3
13. Since parents can readily follow their child's progress in reading, I can focus on other important issues during parent-teacher conferences.	2.6	-	-	9	42.9	11	52.4	1	4.8
14. Since our school adopted the computer management system, teachers can devote more time in classroom instruction.	3.3	-	-	-	-	4	66.7	2	33.3
*15. The computer management system detracts from the teaching of reading.	2.2	1	16.7	4	66.7	-	-	1	16.7
16. Clear guidelines have been established for matching assessment information with alternative teaching strategies.	3.1	-	-	-	-	18	85.7	3	14.3
17. The computer management system reports provide excellent feedback for parents.	3.2	-	-	-	-	5	83.3	1	16.7
18. A common commitment by the Board, administration, and teachers to the mastery learning program has helped to ensure its success.	3.2	-	-	1	4.8	15	71.4	5	23.8
*19. The usefulness of the mastery learning program varies depending on the child's ability.	2.6	2	10.5	5	26.3	11	57.9	1	5.3

*High mean response indicates an unfavorable finding.

Table 2.69 - (cont'd)

MONTEVIDEO: TEACHER OPINIONS

N = 21

		Scale							
		Strongly Disagree (1)		Disagree (2)		Agree (3)		Strongly Agree (4)	
Item	Mean Response	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
20. Reading instruction in our school has been significantly improved through adoption of the mastery learning approach.	3.6	-	-%	-	-%	4	36.4%	7	63.6%
21. I can document positive change in the reading ability of students since the mastery learning program was adopted.	3.2	-	-	1	11.1	5	55.6	3	33.3
22. The computer management system has helped to individualize instruction.	3.2	-	-	-	-	5	83.3	1	16.7
23. I experience more satisfaction in my job as a teacher since the mastery learning program was adopted.	3.3	-	-	1	10.0	5	50.0	4	40.0
24. I feel more confident in my ability to teach reading since the mastery learning program was adopted.	3.3	-	-	1	11.1	4	44.4	4	44.4
25. Most teachers like the computer management system.	3.2	-	-	-	-	5	83.3	1	16.7
26. The mastery learning approach has broadened my definition of what it means to teach reading.	3.1	-	-	1	6.3	12	75.0	3	18.8
27. Clearly defined objectives ensure that the same curriculum is adopted by all elementary grade reading teachers.	3.5	-	-	-	-	11	52.4	10	47.6
*28. Work and time requirements involved in curriculum development, make mastery learning unfeasible in the long run.	2.0	2	10.5	15	78.9	2	10.5	-	-
29. The instructional practices utilized in mastery learning can be used to improve instruction in areas of learning other than reading.	3.3	-	-	-	-	14	66.7	7	33.3

*High mean response indicates an unfavorable finding.

Table 2.69 - (cont'd)

MONTEVIDEO: TEACHER OPINIONS
N = 21

Item	Mean Response	Strongly Disagree (1)		Disagree (2)		Agree (3)		Strongly Agree (4)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
30. Inservice related to the mastery learning program has improved my skills in teaching reading.	3.2	-	-%	-	-%	15	78.9%	4	21.1%
31. High quality materials for enrichment and extension activities are provided for students who have demonstrated a mastery of a specific skill.	3.2	-	-	-	-	16	76.2	5	23.8
32. The computer management system reports provide excellent feedback for students.	3.2	-	-	2	16.7	3	50.0	2	33.3
33. There are high quality materials available for re-teaching activities for students not mastering a specific skill after initial presentation.	3.1	-	-	1	4.8	16	76.2	4	19.0
34. Teachers spend less time in the recordkeeping process in mastery learning than in a conventional classroom.	3.0	1	4.8	2	9.5	13	61.9	5	23.8
35. The administration in the district is supportive of the mastery learning program.	3.3	-	-	-	-	14	66.7	7	33.3
36. The mastery learning program in this school district has been effectively and efficiently implemented.	3.4	-	-	-	-	12	60.0	8	40.0
37. Regular meetings are conducted to plan and keep people informed in regard to the project.	3.1	-	-	1	4.8	16	76.2	4	19.0

*High mean response indicates an unfavorable finding.

Table 2.70

MONTEVIDEO: TEACHER SURVEY - INSERVICE DATA

N = 21

Inservice Training	N	%*
Developing objectives	7	33.3%
Writing test items	21	100.0
Computer management system	5	23.8
Mastery learning program goals, objectives, definition	6	28.6
Instructional techniques/strategies related to reading	11	52.4
Correctives development and/or use	7	33.3
Extensions development and/or use	11	52.4
Mastery learning programs in other districts	4	19.0
Correlating resources to objectives	6	28.6

*Percentages do not add to 100% due to multiple responses.

2.9 DEER RIVER

2.9.1 Parent Survey

Demographic data obtained from the Deer River respondents
is presented in Table 2.71. These parents had a relatively low level
of formal education and the highest average number of children in
school per family.

Table 2.72 shows the Deer River parents' involvement in various
aspects of the school reading program. A total of 88.7% of these
parents work with their child to complete homework assignments and
84.9% attend conferences with their child's reading teacher. Roughly
one-third of them also work as volunteer aides, a commendable result.

Responses to the opinion items are contained in Table 2.73.
The majority of Deer River parents expressed agreement with all but
two survey items. Over half of these parents disagree that the mastery
learning program has made them feel more involved with their child's
reading (Item 6) or has resulted in more contact with their child's
teachers (Item 10). Interestingly, 45.3% of these parents also do
not understand how reading is taught in the mastery learning reading
program (Item 12).

Over 90% of Deer River parents "agreed" or "strongly agreed" with
Items 1, 7, 17, 20, 23, and 24. These parents read stories to their
children and limit their child's TV viewing. They believe their
children enjoy reading, and read library books on a regular basis.
They claim they can easily follow their child's progress in reading,
and believe that the school's reading program aims to stimulate a
desire to read in each child.

2.9.2 Student Survey

Table 2.74 gives the grade level distribution of the 207 first,
second, and third graders from Deer River who completed the survey.
Their responses to the survey items are presented in Table 2.75.

Over 85% of respondents rated Items 1, 3, 4, 14, 16, and 17
positively, indicating that they like to read, read at home, and know
the importance of reading well. They know what to do and what to work
on in reading class, and report that someone is always available to
help them.

Half of the Deer River students report that their reading class
is too easy. Of all the schools, they were the least apt to say
"I like to read" (88.3%) and "I know how well other students can
read (33.8%). Their response to the item "There are too many tests
in my reading class" was much different from the response of any other
school, and may suggest that this component of the mastery learning
program was implemented differently in Deer River. A total of 83.9%
of Deer River students agreed with this statement, as compared to an
18.3% "yes" response rate by students in the other schools.

Table 2.71

DEER RIVER: PARENT SURVEY - DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

N = 106

	Level of Formal Education									
	8th Grade or Less		HS Diploma		College		Masters		Ph.D.	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Mother	3	3.0%	74	73.3%	21	20.8%	3	3.0%	–	–%
Father	6	6.2	64	66.0	24	24.7	3	3.1	–	–

Number of Children in School	N	%
1	19	18.4%
2	36	35.0
3	31	30.1
4	8	7.8
5	7	6.8
6+	2	1.9

Table 2.72

DEER RIVER: PARENT SURVEY

INVOLVEMENT WITH SCHOOL READING PROGRAM

N = 106

Involvement	N	%*
Work with my child to complete homework assignments.	94	88.7%
Attend conferences with my child's reading teacher.	90	84.9
Attend meetings or workshops related to the mastery learning reading program.	30	28.3
Observe children during reading instruction.	22	20.8
Supervise students at school while they work on assignments.	19	17.9
Help to develop or organize curriculum/resource materials.	3	2.8
Work as a volunteer aide.	34	32.1
Work as a paid instructional aide.	4	3.8
Provide classroom instruction.	4	3.8
Provide input in decision making and policy.	6	5.7
Participate through a Parent Advisory Committee.	2	1.9

*Percentages do not add to 100% due to multiple responses.

Table 2.73

DEER RIVER: PARENT OPINIONS

N = 106

		Scale							
		Strongly Disagree (1)		Disagree (2)		Agree (3)		Strongly Agree (4)	
Item	Mean Response	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. It is easy for me to follow my child's progress in reading.	3.1	1	1.0%	8	8.2%	65	67.0%	23	23.7%
2. Reports produced through the computer management system were discussed during parent-teacher conferences.	2.9	8	8.9	15	16.7	47	52.2	20	22.2
3. I am regularly informed of the number and percentage of objectives my child attains in reading.	3.1	2	2.1	9	9.4	61	63.5	24	25.0
4. I am in regular contact with my child's teacher/teachers about his/her reading.	2.8	5	5.5	22	24.2	49	53.8	15	16.5
5. Materials are made available that I can use at home to help my child read.	2.6	8	9.0	28	31.5	45	50.6	8	9.0
6. Since the mastery learning program was started, I feel more involved in my child's reading.	2.5	8	9.0	39	43.8	32	36.0	10	11.2
7. I read stories to my child at home.	3.4	1	1.0	5	5.2	48	49.5	43	44.3
8. I talk with my child about the stories we read.	3.2	1	1.0	9	9.2	55	56.1	33	33.7
9. I encourage my children to make up their own stories.	3.0	1	1.1	17	18.1	57	60.6	19	20.2
10. I have more contact with my child's teacher/teachers since the mastery learning program was implemented.	2.3	10	12.0	45	54.2	20	24.1	8	9.6
11. Someone at the school has explained why my child was placed at their current level in reading.	2.8	10	10.4	21	21.9	45	46.9	20	20.8
12. I understand how reading is taught in the mastery learning reading program.	2.6	9	9.5	34	35.8	40	42.1	12	12.6

Table 2.73 - (cont'd)

DEER RIVER: PARENT OPINIONS

N = 106

			Scale						
	Mean	Strongly Disagree (1)		Disagree (2)		Agree (3)		Strongly Agree (4)	
Item	Response	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
13. Reports produced through the computer management system make it easier to monitor my child's progress in reading.	2.7	11	11.8%	20	21.5%	52	55.9%	10	10.8%
14. I carefully follow my child's progress in reading.	3.1	1	1.0	12	12.4	64	66.0	20	20.6
15. Through the computer management reports, I have become more aware of my child's reading skills.	2.7	9	9.7	23	24.7	50	53.8	11	11.8
16. If my child masters all the objectives identified in the computer management report, then the instructional program is appropriate.	2.8	2	2.5	17	21.0	54	66.7	8	9.9
17. An objective of the reading program at our school is to stimulate a desire to read on the part of every child.	3.2	2	2.2	5	5.4	62	67.4	23	25.0
18. I talk with my child about his/her reading assignments.	3.1	1	1.0	9	9.4	66	68.8	20	20.8
19. If my child is not reading at a level I find acceptable, I increase the amount of time my child works on reading at home.	2.8	-	-	23	30.7	47	62.7	5	6.7
20. I limit the amount of time my child spends watching TV.	3.1	3	3.2	5	5.3	68	72.3	18	19.1
21. Teachers know what interests my child.	2.9	4	4.3	16	17.4	55	59.8	17	18.5
22. Reading instruction in our school has been significantly improved through adoption of the mastery learning approach.	2.9	4	5.1	8	10.3	54	69.2	12	15.4
23. My child enjoys reading.	3.5	-	-	3	3.0	42	41.6	56	55.4
24. My child reads library books on a regular basis.	3.4	1	1.0	8	8.2	42	42.9	47	48.0

Table 2.74
DEER RIVER: STUDENT SURVEY - GRADE LEVEL OF RESPONDENTS
N = 207

Grade	N	%
1	58	29.3%
2	83	41.9
3	53	26.8
5	1	0.5
Other	3	1.5

Table 2.75
DEER RIVER: STUDENT SURVEY
N = 207

Item	Yes N	Yes %	In Between N	In Between %	No N	No %
1. I like to read.	182	88.3%	1	0.5%	23	11.2%
2. I read well.	172	83.5	2	1.0	32	15.5
3. I read at home.	177	85.9	1	0.5	28	13.6
4. In reading class, someone is always there to help me.	187	90.8	-	-	19	9.2
* 5. My reading class is too hard.	34	16.6	2	1.0	169	82.4
6. My reading class is fun.	174	84.9	-	-	31	15.1
7. I know how well I am doing in reading.	159	77.2	2	1.0	45	21.8
* 8. There are too many tests in my reading class.	172	83.9	-	-	33	16.1
* 9. My reading class is boring.	41	20.5	-	-	159	79.5
10. I know how well other students can read.	69	33.8	1	0.5	135	65.7
11. My friends all read well.	142	70.6	1	0.5	58	28.9
*12. I avoid students who don't read well.	54	26.9	1	0.5	146	72.6
*13. My reading class is too easy.	102	50.2	5	2.5	96	47.3
14. I know what I am supposed to do in my reading class.	180	89.1	1	0.5	21	10.4
15. I read library books more often than last year.	159	77.6	-	-	46	22.4
16. I know what I need to work on in reading.	176	85.9	-	-	29	14.1
17. Reading well is important.	187	94.0	1	0.5	11	5.5

*High percentage of "yes" responses indicates an unfavorable finding.

2.9.3 <u>Teacher Survey</u>

Tables 2.76 and 2.77 give grade level and demographic data for the 17 Deer River elementary teachers completing the survey. Almost half of these teachers have six to ten years experience in teaching. Some of them are quite experienced in mastery learning.

Six survey items (1, 3, 25, 29, 34, 35) received unanimous favorable responses, and several more items also received very favorable ratings, as shown in Table 2.78. Some topics covered by these positive responses include implementing measurable, critically evaluated objectives and benefits of the computer management system for feedback to teachers, students, and parents, to lessen time spent on recordkeeping, and to individualize instruction.

Items 7, 16, 20, 23, 24, 26, and 30 received unfavorable ratings overall by the Deer River respondents. They feel that using the mastery learning program has not resulted in smaller reading groups, and they lack clear guidelines for matching assessment information with alternative teaching strategies. The majority of respondents feel that the mastery learning program has not enhanced their abilities or enjoyment in teaching reading, nor that the mastery learning approach has significantly improved reading instruction in their school.

The survey included a section asking teachers to indicate what classes, workshops, and inservice training they have been involved in related to mastery learning. Table 2.79 presents this data. Not very many of the Deer River teachers have had training experiences according to the responses. Four indicated that they had been trained in mastery learning program goals, objectives, and definition.

Table 2.76

DEER RIVER: TEACHER SURVEY - GRADE LEVEL PRESENTLY TEACHING

N = 17

Grade	N	%
1	4	25.0%
2	4	25.0
3	2	12.5
4	2	12.5
5	1	6.3
6	2	12.5
K-6	1	6.3

Table 2.77

DEER RIVER: TEACHER SURVEY - DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

N = 17

Number Of Years	Years Experience As Teacher		Years In District		Years In Grade		Years Teaching Reading		Years Experience With Differentiated Staffing		Years Experience With Mastery Learning	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1 - 5	1	5.9%	2	11.8%	8	47.1%	1	5.9%	1	5.9%	7	41.2%
6 - 10	8	47.1	8	47.1	7	41.2	8	47.0	-	-	2	11.8
11 - 15	2	11.8	3	17.7	-	-	3	17.7	-	-	1	5.9
16 - 20	2	11.8	2	11.8	1	5.9	2	11.8	-	-	1	5.9
21+	4	23.6	2	11.8	-	-	3	17.7	-	-	1	5.9
0 or Blank	-	-	-	-	1	5.9	-	-	16	-	5	29.4

Highest Degree Earned	N	%
Bachelors	12	70.6%
Masters	5	29.4

Major	N	%
Elementary Education	12	70.6%
Reading	1	5.9
Ed. Administration	1	5.9
Blank	3	17.6

Table 2.78

DEER RIVER: TEACHER OPINIONS

N = 17

		Scale							
		Strongly Disagree (1)		Disagree (2)		Agree (3)		Strongly Agree (4)	
Item	Mean Response	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. At our school, important reading skills have been stated as measurable objectives.	3.6	-	-%	-	-%	6	35.3%	11	64.7%
2. Objectives proposed for inclusion in our reading program were critically evaluated.	3.4	-	-	1	5.9	9	52.9	7	41.2
3. Objectives should be identified before the students interact with the curriculum.	3.6	-	-	-	-	7	41.2	10	58.8
4. Sufficient time was devoted to the identification of measurable objectives.	3.4	-	-	2	12.5	5	31.3	9	56.3
5. An initial assessment of the child's skill level is essential.	3.6	-	-	1	6.3	5	31.3	10	58.8
6. The diagnostic tests used in the initial placement of students were effective.	2.5	2	13.3	4	26.7	9	60.0	-	-
7. Use of the mastery learning program has resulted in smaller reading groups.	2.2	2	14.3	9	64.3	1	7.1	2	14.3
8. The computer management system reports provide excellent feedback for teachers.	3.2	2	11.8	-	-	7	41.2	8	47.1
9. Correctives and extensions are in place before students begin specific units.	2.9	1	7.7	1	7.7	9	69.2	2	15.4
*10. Mastery learning requires more time in teacher preparation than other ways of teaching.	2.1	2	13.3	10	66.7	2	13.3	1	6.7

*High mean response indicates an unfavorable finding.

-118-

Table 2.78 - (cont'd)

DEER RIVER: TEACHER OPINIONS

N = 17

		Scale							
	Mean	Strongly Disagree (1)		Disagree (2)		Agree (3)		Strongly Agree (4)	
Item	Response	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
*11. There is a shortage of appropriate resources for students who fail to reach the criterion after an initial presentation of the lesson.	2.5	2	11.8%	8	47.1%	4	23.5%	3	17.6%
12. Reports produced through the computer management system make it easy to monitor student progress in reading.	3.2	2	11.8	-	-	8	47.1	7	41.2
13. Since parents can readily follow their child's progress in reading, I can focus on other important issues during parent-teacher conferences.	2.5	2	13.3	4	26.7	8	53.3	1	6.7
14. Since our school adopted the computer management system, teachers can devote more time in classroom instruction.	2.6	2	12.5	3	18.8	10	62.5	1	6.3
*15. The computer management system detracts from the teaching of reading.	1.9	6	35.3	7	41.2	3	17.6	1	5.9
16. Clear guidelines have been established for matching assessment information with alternative teaching strategies.	2.4	3	18.8	4	25.0	8	50.0	1	6.3
17. The computer management system reports provide excellent feedback for parents.	2.9	-	-	5	31.3	7	43.8	4	25.0
18. A common commitment by the Board, administration, and teachers to the mastery learning program has helped to ensure its success.	2.9	1	6.3	3	18.8	9	56.3	3	18.8
*19. The usefulness of the mastery learning program varies depending on the child's ability.	2.5	2	14.3	5	35.7	5	35.7	2	14.3

*High mean response indicates an unfavorable finding.

Table 2.78 - (cont'd)

DEER RIVER: TEACHER OPINIONS

N = 17

			Scale							
			Strongly Disagree (1)		Disagree (2)		Agree (3)		Strongly Agree (4)	
Item	Mean Response	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
20. Reading instruction in our school has been significantly improved through adoption of the mastery learning approach.	2.5	-	-%	4	66.7%	1	16.7%	1	16.7%
21. I can document positive change in the reading ability of students since the mastery learning program was adopted.	2.6	-	-	3	42.9	4	57.1	-	-
22. The computer management system has helped to individualize instruction.	3.0	-	-	1	14.3	5	71.4	1	14.3
23. I experience more satisfaction in my job as a teacher since the mastery learning program was adopted.	2.0	1	16.7	4	66.7	1	16.7	-	-
24. I feel more confident in my ability to teach reading since the mastery learning program was adopted.	1.8	1	16.7	5	83.3	-	-	-	-
25. Most teachers like the computer management system.	3.0	-	-	-	-	5	100.0	-	-
26. The mastery learning approach has broadened my definition of what it means to teach reading.	2.4	-	-	3	60.0	2	40.0	-	-
27. Clearly defined objectives ensure that the same curriculum is adopted by all elementary grade reading teachers.	2.6	1	14.3	2	28.6	3	42.9	1	14.3
*28. Work and time requirements involved in curriculum development, make mastery learning unfeasible in the long run.	2.3	-	-	5	83.3	-	-	1	16.7
29. The instructional practices utilized in mastery learning can be used to improve instruction in areas of learning other than reading.	3.0	-	-	-	-	7	100.0	-	-

*High mean response indicates an unfavorable finding.

Table 2.78 - (cont'd)

DEER RIVER: TEACHER OPINIONS

N = 17

		Scale							
		Strongly Disagree (1)		Disagree (2)		Agree (3)		Strongly Agree (4)	
Item	Mean Response	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
30. Inservice related to the mastery learning program has improved my skills in teaching reading.	2.1	-	-%	6	85.7%	1	14.3%	-	-%
31. High quality materials for enrichment and extension activities are provided for students who have demonstrated a mastery of a specific skill.	2.8	1	16.7	-	-	4	66.7	1	16.7
32. The computer management system reports provide excellent feedback for students.	3.0	-	-	1	14.3	5	71.4	1	14.3
33. There are high quality materials available for re-teaching activities for students not mastering a specific skill after initial presentation.	2.7	-	-	2	28.6	5	71.4	-	-
34. Teachers spend less time in the recordkeeping process in mastery learning than in a conventional classroom.	3.3	-	-	-	-	5	71.4	2	28.6
35. The administration in the district is supportive of the mastery learning program.	3.3	-	-	-	-	5	71.4	2	28.6
36. The mastery learning program in this school district has been effectively and efficiently implemented.	2.9	-	-	1	14.3	6	85.7	-	-
37. Regular meetings are conducted to plan and keep people informed in regard to the project.	2.6	1	14.3	1	14.3	5	71.4	-	-

*High mean response indicates an unfavorable finding.

Table 2.79

DEER RIVER: TEACHER SURVEY - INSERVICE DATA

N = 17

Inservice Training	N	%*
Developing objectives	-	-%
Writing test items	-	-
Computer management system	4	23.5
Mastery learning program goals, objectives, definition	3	17.6
Instructional techniques/strategies related to reading	1	5.9
Correctives development and/or use	2	11.8
Extensions development and/or use	-	-
Mastery learning programs in other districts	1	5.9
Correlating resources to objectives	1	5.9

*Percentages do not add to 100% due to multiple responses.

2.10 MINNEAPOLIS

Student surveys were the only data obtained from the Minneapolis school district. Minneapolis was one of the "start-up" sites, and their mastery learning program had not yet been implemented to an extent that would warrant administering the parent and teacher surveys.

2.10.1 Student Survey

Table 2.80 shows the distribution by grade level of the 232 Minneapolis elementary school students.

Responses to the seventeen survey items are presented in Table 2.81. None of the items received an overall unfavorable rating, although opinion was nearly divided on Item 13, "My reading class is too easy." Of all the schools, Minneapolis students had the highest percentage of "yes" responses (94.0%) to the item "I like to read," yet they were least apt to agree with the statement "My reading class is fun." Over 85% of the respondents agreed with statements 1, 2, 14, 16, and 17:

1. I like to read.
2. I read well.
14. I know what I am supposed to do in reading class.
16. I know what I need to work on in reading.
17. Reading well is important.

Table 2.80

MINNEAPOLIS: STUDENT SURVEY - GRADE LEVEL OF RESPONDENTS

N = 232

Grade	N	%
1	61	26.5%
2	71	30.9
3	42	18.3
4	52	22.6
6	1	0.4
Other	3	1.3

Table 2.81

MINNEAPOLIS: STUDENT SURVEY

N = 232

Item	Yes N	Yes %	In Between N	In Between %	No N	No %
1. I like to read.	218	94.0%	-	-%	14	6.0%
2. I read well.	205	88.4	-	-	27	11.6
3. I read at home.	193	83.9	-	-	37	16.1
4. In reading class, someone is always there to help me.	163	70.6	-	-	68	29.4
* 5. My reading class is too hard.	34	14.7	-	-	198	85.3
6. My reading class is fun.	181	78.7	2	0.9	47	20.4
7. I know how well I am doing in reading.	180	78.3	-	-	50	21.7
* 8. There are too many tests in my reading class.	58	25.0	-	-	174	75.0
* 9. My reading class is boring.	71	30.7	-	-	160	69.3
10. I know how well other students can read.	155	67.7	-	-	74	32.3
11. My friends all read well.	146	63.2	-	-	85	36.8
*12. I avoid students who don't read well.	44	19.4	-	-	183	80.6
*13. My reading class is too easy.	108	47.0	1	0.4	121	52.6
14. I know what I am supposed to do in my reading class.	205	89.9	-	-	23	10.1
15. I read library books more often than last year.	178	78.1	1	0.4	49	21.5
16. I know what I need to work on in reading.	199	86.1	-	-	32	13.9
17. Reading well is important.	215	96.0	-	-	9	4.0

*High percentage of "yes" responses indicates an unfavorabl. nding.

2.11 ALL SCHOOLS

2.11.1 Parent Survey

The total number of responding parents from the mastery learning demonstration sites was 1,504. Nine groups of parents are included as shown in Table 2.82, since parent data from Minneapolis was not collected. Table 2.83 provides demographic data for the full sample of parents and for each site.

The suburban sites (Hopkins, Minnetonka, Stillwater*) have distinct demographic characteristics as compared to the rural schools involved in the mastery learning program. Parent surveys from the suburban districts indicate that in each case over 65% of the parents had college education; by comparison less than half of the parents in the rural districts have had this level of education. Parents in each of the suburban districts also show a pattern of having fewer children in school than is the case in the rural districts. St. Cloud, the only "urban" district for which parent survey data was available, shows demographic characteristics intermediate between those of the rural and suburban schools.

Table 2.84 shows the parental involvement data for the full sample, while Table 2.85 summarizes parental involvement by school. Working with their child to complete homework assignments and attending conferences with their child's reading teachers were the activities reported by the greatest percentage of parents, 88.1% and 80.1% respectively. Almost one-third have observed children during reading instruction and attend meetings or workshops related to the mastery learning program. Very few parents were involved in providing classroom instruction, input in decision making and policy, or organizing curriculum/resource materials. Some of these opportunities may not be available to the parents in each district.

Responses to the opinion items for the full sample are presented in Table 2.86. Table 2.87 gives the mean response of each site to each opinion item, as a means to compare survey findings among district. Parent responses to the survey items were very positive, overall - over 70% of all parents "agreed" or "strongly agreed" with all but two of the 24 survey items. Mean ratings ranged from 2.9 to 3.5 for all but these same two items.

The two items which received the fewest affirmative responses were Item 10, "I have more contact with my child's teacher/teachers since the mastery learning program was implemented" (42.7% agreed with this statement) and Item 6, "Since the mastery learning program was started, I feel more involved in my child's reading" (63.9% agree with this). These percentages do not indicate shortcomings

---

* Although Stillwater was classified as a "rural" district in the "request for proposal" materials, it is in Washington County and thus is part of the seven-county Twin Cities Metropolitan Area.

Table 2.82

DISTRIBUTION OF PARENT SURVEY RESPONDENTS

BY DISTRICT

Number of Parents	District
144	Stillwater
104	Minnetonka
134	Hopkins
189	Montgomery
110	Wheaton
203	Staples
159	St. Cloud
317	Montevideo
106	Deer River
-	Minneapolis

Table 2.83

FULL SAMPLE: PARENT SURVEY - DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

N = 1,504

	Level of Formal Education of Mother										Level of Formal Education of Father									
	8th Grade or Less		HS Diploma		College		Masters		Ph.D.		8th Grade or Less		HS Diploma		College		Masters		Ph.D.	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Stillwater	1	0.7%	46	33.6%	75	54.7%	13	9.5%	2	1.5%	1	0.7%	43	31.2%	63	45.7%	20	14.5%	11	8.0%
Minnetonka	-	-	27	26.7	66	65.3	8	7.9	-	-	-	-	27	26.2	56	54.4	15	14.6	5	4.9
Hopkins	-	-	34	26.0	86	65.6	11	8.4	-	-	1	0.8	32	25.0	64	50.0	26	20.3	5	3.9
Montgomery	7	3.8	140	75.7	37	20.0	1	0.5	-	-	14	8.0	120	68.2	41	23.3	-	-	1	0.6
Wheaton	-	-	60	56.6	46	43.4	-	-	-	-	2	1.9	53	51.5	43	41.7	3	2.9	2	1.9
Staples	11	5.6	134	68.7	46	23.6	4	2.1	-	-	5	2.7	118	63.8	51	27.6	9	4.9	2	1.1
St. Cloud	1	0.6	89	57.4	52	33.5	13	8.4	-	-	1	0.7	74	50.3	47	32.0	15	10.2	10	6.8
Montevideo	3	1.0	201	66.3	93	30.7	6	2.0	-	-	8	2.7	183	60.8	93	30.9	11	3.7	6	2.0
Deer River	3	3.0	74	73.3	21	20.8	3	3.0	-	-	6	6.2	64	66.0	24	24.7	3	3.1	-	-
All Schools	27	1.9	824	56.9	534	36.9	60	4.1	3	0.2	41	2.9	728	51.7	491	34.9	104	7.4	44	3.1

	Number of Children in School											
	1		2		3		4		5		6 or more	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Stillwater	58	41.1%	59	41.8%	20	14.2%	3	2.1%	1	0.7%	-	-%
Minnetonka	39	38.6	49	48.5	9	8.9	2	2.0	1	1.0	1	1.0
Hopkins	45	34.1	69	52.3	14	10.6	1	0.8	2	1.5	1	0.8
Montgomery	60	32.1	72	38.5	39	20.9	11	5.9	2	1.1	3	1.6
Wheaton	29	26.9	47	43.5	23	21.3	9	8.3	-	-	-	-
Staples	45	22.8	80	40.6	47	23.9	18	9.1	4	2.0	3	1.5
St. Cloud	48	31.2	71	46.2	27	17.5	7	4.5	1	0.6	-	-
Montevideo	72	23.7	139	45.7	64	21.1	28	9.2	1	0.3	-	-
Deer River	19	18.4	36	35.0	31	30.1	8	7.8	7	6.8	2	1.9
All Schools	424	29.0	635	43.5	283	19.4	89	6.1	19	1.3	11	1.7

Table 2.84

FULL SAMPLE: PARENT SURVEY

INVOLVEMENT WITH SCHOOL READING PROGRAM

N = 1,504

Involvement	N	%*
Work with my child to complete homework assignments.	1,325	88.1%
Attend conferences with my child's reading teacher.	1,204	80.1
Attend meetings or workshops related to the mastery learning reading program.	436	29.0
Observe children during reading instruction.	476	31.6
Supervise students at school while they work on assignments.	229	15.2
Help to develop or organize curriculum/resource materials.	67	4.5
Work as a volunteer aide.	323	21.5
Work as a paid instructional aide.	44	2.9
Provide classroom instruction.	43	2.9
Provide input in decision making and policy.	55	3.7
Participate through a Parent Advisory Committee.	77	5.1

*Percentages do not add to 100% due to multiple responses.

Table 2.85

PARENT SURVEY

INVOLVEMENT WITH SCHOOL READING PROGRAM

PERCENTAGE OF PARENTS INVOLVED IN EACH ACTIVITY BY SCHOOL AND OVERALL

	Help With Homework	Parent-Teacher Conference	Mastery Learning Meetings	Observe Reading Class	Supervise	Help With Cur- riculum	Volunteer Aide	Paid Aide	Classroom Instruction	Policy Input	Parent Advisory Committee
Stillwater	63.9	78.5	43.1	54.9	12.5	1.4	18.1	3.5	1.4	2.1	7.6
Minnetonka	89.4	68.3	6.7	13.5	8.7	2.9	12.5	3.8	2.9	1.9	1.0
Hopkins	92.5	82.1	8.2	14.9	6.7	7.5	28.4	1.5	3.0	4.5	9.0
Montgomery	97.4	80.4	49.2	38.6	4.8	4.2	3.7	2.1	1.1	2.1	4.2
Wheaton	98.2	89.1	71.8	54.5	21.8	10.0	34.5	0.9	2.7	7.3	13.6
Staples	79.8	84.2	6.4	17.2	11.8	3.0	14.3	2.5	3.9	3.4	2.5
St. Cloud	92.5	85.5	35.8	20.1	10.7	3.8	11.3	1.9	2.5	3.8	5.0
Montevideo	90.9	74.8	22.7	41.0	30.9	5.0	35.3	5.0	4.1	3.8	3.8
Deer River	88.7	84.9	28.3	20.8	17.9	2.8	32.1	3.8	3.8	5.7	1.9
Full Sample	88.1	80.1	29.0	31.6	15.2	4.5	21.5	2.9	2.9	3.7	5.1

Table 2.86

FULL SAMPLE: PARENT OPINIONS

N = 1,504

		Scale							
		Strongly Disagree (1)		Disagree (2)		Agree (3)		Strongly Agree (4)	
Item	Mean Response	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. It is easy for me to follow my child's progress in reading.	3.2	8	0.6%	104	7.3%	852	59.9%	459	32.3%
2. Reports produced through the computer management system were discussed during parent-teacher conferences.	3.1	45	4.3	152	14.7	536	51.8	302	29.2
3. I am regularly informed of the number and percentage of objectives my child attains in reading.	3.1	36	2.6	192	14.0	793	58.0	347	25.4
4. I am in regular contact with my child's teacher/teachers about his/her reading.	2.9	31	2.3	274	20.1	802	58.9	254	18.7
5. Materials are made available that I can use at home to help my child read.	2.9	46	3.5	255	19.5	747	57.2	258	19.8
6. Since the mastery learning program was started, I feel more involved in my child's reading.	2.8	49	4.0	398	32.1	571	46.1	221	17.8
7. I read stories to my child at home.	3.4	5	0.4	61	4.3	712	49.9	650	45.5
8. I talk with my child about the stories we read.	3.3	5	0.4	76	5.3	810	57.0	530	37.3
9. I encourage my children to make up their own stories.	3.1	13	0.9	220	16.0	814	59.3	325	23.7
10. I have more contact with my child's teacher/teachers since the mastery learning program was implemented.	2.5	61	5.3	603	52.1	406	35.1	88	7.6
11. Someone at the school has explained why my child was placed at their current level in reading.	2.9	58	4.3	270	19.9	770	56.7	260	19.1
12. I understand how reading is taught in the mastery learning reading program.	2.9	56	4.1	305	22.3	779	56.9	230	16.8

Table 2.86 - (cont'd)

FULL SAMPLE: PARENT OPINIONS
N = 1,504

		Scale								
		Strongly Disagree (1)		Disagree (2)		Agree (3)		Strongly Agree (4)		
Item	Mean Response	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
13. Reports produced through the computer management system make it easier to monitor my child's progress in reading.	2.9	45	4.2%	223	20.8%	586	54.7%	218	20.3%
14. I carefully follow my child's progress in reading.	3.2	4	0.3	117	8.4	854	61.2	420	30.1
15. Through the computer management reports, I have become more aware of my child's reading skills.	2.9	43	4.0	270	25.4	538	50.5	214	20.1
16. If my child masters all the objectives identified in the computer management report, then the instructional program is appropriate.	2.9	25	2.5	157	15.9	651	65.9	155	15.7
17. An objective of the reading program at our school is to stimulate a desire to read on the part of every child.	3.4	6	0.4	31	2.3	813	59.2	523	38.1
18. I talk with my child about his/her reading assignments.	3.2	5	0.4	86	6.2	927	66.4	379	27.1
19. If my child is not reading at a level I find acceptable, I increase the amount of time my child works on reading at home.	2.9	23	1.9	290	24.5	712	60.2	158	13.4
20. I limit the amount of time my child spends watching TV.	3.1	14	1.0	142	10.2	879	62.8	364	26.0
21. Teachers know what interests my child.	3.0	16	1.2	150	11.4	924	70.4	223	17.0
22. Reading instruction in our school has been significantly improved through adoption of the mastery learning approach.	3.1	18	1.7	98	9.3	673	64.1	261	24.9
23. My child enjoys reading.	3.5	8	0.6	68	4.7	612	42.5	751	52.2
24. My child reads library books on a regular basis.	3.4	5	0.4	110	7.8	605	43.1	685	48.8

-131-

Table 2.87

PARENT OPINIONS - MEAN RESPONSE BY ITEM BY SCHOOL AND OVERALL

												Item												
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
Stillwater	3.0	2.9	2.9	2.9	2.8	2.4	3.6	3.5	3.3	2.2	2.4	2.6	2.5	3.1	2.5	2.7	3.3	3.1	2.8	3.4	3.0	2.7	3.4	3.3
Minnetonka	3.1	2.5	2.7	2.9	3.1	2.9	3.4	3.3	3.1	2.5	2.8	2.6	2.4	3.0	2.4	2.8	3.5	3.2	2.9	3.3	3.2	3.3	3.4	3.4
Hopkins	3.5	3.3	3.4	3.2	3.0	2.9	3.6	3.5	3.2	2.5	3.2	3.1	3.3	3.5	3.2	3.0	3.5	3.3	2.9	3.3	3.2	3.1	3.6	3.6
Montgomery	3.3	2.8	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.3	3.2	2.9	2.5	2.9	3.0	3.0	3.2	2.9	3.0	3.3	3.2	2.9	3.0	2.9	3.3	3.4	3.4
Wheaton	3.6	3.6	3.5	3.1	3.1	3.4	3.5	3.3	2.9	2.9	2.9	3.2	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.3	3.5	3.3	2.9	3.0	3.0	3.4	3.6	3.5
Staples	3.1	3.2	3.1	3.0	2.9	2.7	3.3	3.2	3.0	2.4	3.1	2.8	2.9	3.2	2.9	2.9	3.3	3.1	2.8	3.1	3.0	3.1	3.4	3.4
St. Cloud	3.3	3.0	3.0	2.9	3.0	2.9	3.4	3.2	3.1	2.4	3.1	3.0	2.9	3.2	2.8	3.0	3.3	3.2	2.8	3.1	3.1	3.3	3.4	3.3
Montevideo	3.2	3.0	3.0	2.8	2.9	2.7	3.3	3.3	3.0	2.4	2.9	2.9	3.0	3.2	2.8	2.9	3.3	3.2	2.9	3.1	3.0	3.1	3.5	3.4
Deer River	3.1	2.9	3.1	2.8	2.6	2.5	3.4	3.2	3.0	2.3	2.8	2.6	2.7	3.1	2.7	2.8	3.2	3.1	2.8	3.1	2.9	2.9	3.5	3.4
Full Sample	3.2	3.1	3.1	2.9	2.9	2.8	3.4	3.3	3.1	2.5	2.9	2.9	2.9	3.2	2.9	2.9	3.4	3.2	2.9	3.1	3.0	3.1	3.5	3.4

in the mastery learning program, however. Only two of the districts involved in the parent survey were "start-up" sites; the others have had mastery learning techniques in place prior to 1986-87. Thus for many parents, mastery learning may be the only approach to teaching reading they have experienced with respect to their primary-school child. Also, given the strong parental commitment to see that their children become successful readers (as reflected in other survey items), many parents would be involved in their child's reading and in touch with their teachers even without the mastery learning program.

Not only do over 70% of all parents agree with 22 of the 24 survey items, 8 items received a favorable response from over 90% of the respondents (Items 1, 7, 8, 14, 17, 18, 23, 24). The opinion items were designed to assess the level of parent participation and involvement in helping their child learn to read, and to learn their views on the effectiveness of the mastery learning approach as implemented in their school. Their responses show a high level of parental involvement in developing their child's reading skills and satisfaction with the mastery learning reading program. The items with the highest percentage of parents in agreement relate mostly to parent/child activities or characteristics (e.g., I read stories to my child, I talk with my child about the stories we read and about reading assignments, I carefully follow my child's progress in reading, My child enjoys reading and reads library books on a regular basis) rather than items relating specifically to the mastery learning program.

Nonetheless, a large majority of parents feel that the computer management reports are helpful and that "Reading instruction in our school has significantly improved through adoption of the mastery learning approach."

2.11.2 Student Survey

A total of 3,127 students from the ten demonstration sites completed the survey, distributed by site (district) as shown in Table 2.88. Hopkins and Montevideo both had just over 500 student respondents.

Table 2.89 lists the distribution of the student survey respondents by grade level by site, and also gives the full sample distribution. Almost 90% of the students were from grades 1 through 3, with second graders being most heavily represented. All of the kindergarten respondents were from the Stillwater demonstration site, while most of the fourth graders were from Montevideo and Minneapolis. The individual demonstration sites tended to have a fairly even distribution of first, second, and third graders completing the survey.

The overall student results are quite favorable, as shown in Table 2.90. Table 2.91 summarizes these survey results by school. Eighty-five percent or more of the students overall responded favorably to these items:

Table 2.88

DISTRIBUTION OF STUDENT SURVEY RESPONDENTS

BY DISTRICT

Number of Students	District
321	Stillwater
330	Minnetonka
516	Hopkins
205	Montgomery
119	Wheaton
295	Staples
344	St. Cloud
509	Montevideo
207	Deer River
232	Minneapolis

Table 2.89

STUDENT SURVEY - GRADE LEVEL OF RESPONDENTS BY SCHOOL AND OVERALL

N = 3,127

	Grade															
	K		1		2		3		4		5		6		Other	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Stillwater	101	33.8%	68	22.7%	118	39.5%	12	4.0%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%
Minnetonka	-	-	117	36.9	85	26.8	115	36.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hopkins	-	-	99	19.7	196	39.0	163	32.5	35	7.0	3	0.6	6	1.2	-	-
Montgomery	-	-	80	39.0	67	32.7	58	28.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Wheaton	-	-	40	32.3	44	35.5	39	31.5	1	0.8	-	-	-	-	-	-
Staples	-	-	93	31.6	95	32.3	106	36.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
St. Cloud	-	-	118	34.5	111	32.5	109	31.9	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	1.2
Montevideo	-	-	138	27.0	138	27.0	110	21.5	124	24.3	1	0.2	-	-	-	-
Deer River	-	-	58	29.3	83	41.9	53	26.8	-	-	1	0.5	3	1.5	-	-
Minneapolis	-	-	61	26.5	71	30.9	42	18.3	52	22.6	-	-	1	0.4	3	1.3
Full Sample	101	3.3	875	28.9	1,011	33.4	808	26.7	212	7.0	5	0.2	10	0.3	7	0.2

Table 2.90

ALL SCHOOLS: STUDENT SURVEY

N = 3,127

Item	Yes		In Between		No	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. I like to read.	2,811	91.7%	18	0.6%	237	7.7%
2. I read well.	2,728	88.8	22	0.7	321	10.5
3. I read at home.	2,638	86.2	14	0.5	408	13.3
4. In reading class, someone is always there to help me.	2,430	79.4	29	0.9	601	19.6
* 5. My reading class is too hard.	389	12.8	26	0.9	2,629	86.4
6. My reading class is fun.	2,592	85.0	20	0.7	436	14.3
7. I know how well I am doing in reading.	2,254	74.0	10	0.3	781	25.6
* 8. There are too many tests in my reading class.	692	22.7	9	0.3	2,349	77.0
* 9. My reading class is boring.	667	22.0	11	0.4	2,358	77.7
10. I know how well other students can read.	1,862	61.3	8	0.3	1,169	38.5
11. My friends all read well.	2,066	68.0	25	0.8	946	31.1
*12. I avoid students who don't read well.	638	21.1	17	0.6	2,369	78.3
*13. My reading class is too easy.	1,417	46.7	30	1.0	1,585	52.3
14. I know what I am supposed to do in my reading class.	2,779	91.5	11	0.4	247	8.1
15. I read library books more often than last year.	2,402	79.0	8	0.3	632	20.8
16. I know what I need to work on in reading.	2,644	87.1	12	0.4	380	12.5
17. Reading well is important.	2,843	96.1	6	0.2	109	3.7

*High percentage of "yes" responses indicates an unfavorable finding.

Table 2.91

STUDENT SURVEY

STUDENT RESPONSE BY ITEM BY SCHOOL AND OVERALL

(PERCENTAGE OF "YES" RESPONSES GIVEN FOR EACH ITEM)

															Item			
	1	2	3	4	5*	6	7	8*	9*	10	11	12*	13*	14	15	16	17
Stillwater	92.8	96.0	89.3	76.5	17.6	90.2	71.2	20.4	16.2	51.3	75.2	33.4	51.3	91.1	66.1	87.5	96.4
Minnetonka	91.3	89.4	90.7	79.8	8.8	81.1	73.3	21.6	25.6	64.8	70.4	20.4	45.4	92.5	80.4	83.4	98.4
Hopkins	93.9	91.1	90.1	87.5	8.4	88.9	78.0	10.5	14.4	61.4	58.4	12.6	33.9	93.8	82.3	88.8	95.9
Montgomery	89.7	85.8	85.7	89.6	14.5	86.1	79.9	14.8	24.6	80.4	79.7	28.2	55.9	90.1	80.7	84.1	96.5
Wheaton	89.3	91.8	87.7	59.3	18.9	84.2	66.7	37.7	32.8	65.3	68.3	14.4	59.5	91.8	88.6	89.3	96.4
Staples	90.2	79.7	77.6	82.2	14.6	82.3	70.4	14.6	25.3	70.8	61.5	20.7	43.1	90.2	72.6	88.9	93.1
St. Cloud	89.5	89.8	79.9	79.9	12.8	84.4	68.1	20.7	24.0	53.6	72.1	26.2	52.4	91.5	75.2	84.8	97.0
Montevideo	92.8	89.1	87.7	71.5	11.1	85.2	74.5	16.7	20.3	64.3	69.1	16.3	47.6	91.8	86.9	89.5	96.6
Deer River	88.3	83.5	85.9	90.8	16.6	84.9	77.2	83.9	20.5	33.8	70.6	26.9	50.2	89.1	77.6	85.9	94.0
Minneapolis	94.0	88.4	83.9	70.6	14.7	78.7	78.3	25.0	30.7	67.7	63.2	19.4	47.0	89.9	78.1	86.1	96.0
Full Sample	91.7	88.8	86.2	79.4	12.8	85.0	74.0	22.7	22.0	61.3	68.0	21.1	46.7	91.5	79.0	87.1	96.1

*High percentage of "yes" responses indicates an unfavorable finding.

1. I like to read.
2. I read well.
3. I read at home.
5. My reading class is too hard. (favorable response is "no")
6. My reading class is fun.
14. I know what I am supposed to do in my reading class.
16. I know what I need to work on in reading.
17. Reading well is important.

The student survey did not include items asking students to compare mastery learning to other teaching methods, and they would lack the experience to make such judgments. Yet their responses would suggest that a large majority of the students are satisfied with the reading program, and it appears to be instilling desirable attitudes toward reading in the children. Most of the students report that they enjoy reading, read at home, and think reading well is important. The reading program makes clear to them what they are supposed to do, and what they need to work on in reading.

Item 13, "My reading class is too easy," was answered "yes" by 46.7% of the students and thus is the facet of the mastery learning program with the most room for improvement, judging by the percentages of responses to the student survey items. The mastery learning philosophy states that all students can learn, and the low percentage of "yes" responses (12.8%) to the companion item "My reading class is too hard" suggests that most students, including the slower learners, are being reached by the mastery learning approach. However, the response to Item 13 indicates that more could be done to challenge the better students. The mastery learning program includes extensions for these students who do not need to retest on the learning objectives, and these have been in place in the demonstration sites, but this finding suggests that perhaps these extensions are not sufficiently challenging to fully develop the students' reading potential.

2.11.3 Teacher Survey

In all, 277 elementary teachers from nine demonstration sites participated in the teacher survey. (Teacher surveys were not administered in Minneapolis since their program was not yet fully implemented.) A total of 111 teachers, 40% of the overall teacher sample, were from the Hopkins district; Table 2.92 gives the distribution of respondents by school district. Table 2.93 presents their distribution by grade level of instruction. A majority of the teachers teach in grades K-3, the grades targeted by the state; however, significant numbers of teachers of intermediate grades also submitted the survey.

Table 2.94 shows that the respondents in these demonstration sites include many experienced teachers; nearly 60% have over 15 years of teaching experience. Comparable longevity in their present district and as a reading teacher was reported. However, over 85% reported less than five years of experience with differentiated staffing and the mastery learning approach. One-fifth of the

Table 2.92

DISTRIBUTION OF TEACHER SURVEY RESPONDENTS

BY DISTRICT

Number of Teachers	District
9	Stillwater
40	Minnetonka
111	Hopkins
12	Montgomery
12	Wheaton
17	Staples
36	St. Cloud
21	Montevideo
17	Deer River
-	Minneapolis

Table 2.93

FULL SAMPLE: TEACHER SURVEY

GRADE LEVEL PRESENTLY TEACHING

N = 277

Grade Level	N	%
1	53	23.5%
2	43	19.0
3	34	15.0
4	20	8.8
5	6	2.7
6	8	3.5
K - 1	1	0.4
K - 2	3	1.3
K - 6	9	4.0
1 - 2	4	1.8
2 - 3	6	2.7
1 - 3	5	2.2
3 - 4	15	6.6
5 - 6	18	8.0
3 - 6	1	0.4

Table 2.94

FULL SAMPLE: TEACHER SURVEY - DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

N = 277

Number Of Years	Years Experience As Teacher		Years In District		Years In Grade		Years Teaching Reading		Years Experience With Differentiated Staffing		Years Experience With Mastery Learning	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1 - 5	24	8.7%	36	13.0%	104	37.5%	29	10.5%	23	8.3%	205	74.0%
6 - 10	31	11.2	43	15.5	59	21.3	40	14.4	8	2.9	11	4.0
11 - 15	42	15.2	38	13.7	25	9.0	41	14.8	16	5.8	19	6.9
16 - 20	77	27.8	85	30.7	32	11.6	69	24.9	9	3.2	4	1.4
21+	84	30.3	56	20.2	22	7.9	71	25.6	4	1.4	3	1.1
0 or Blank	19	6.9	19	6.9	35	12.6	27	9.7	217	78.3	35	12.6

Highest Degree Earned	N	%
Bachelors	186	67.1%
Masters	58	20.9
Blank	33	11.9

Major	N	%
Elementary Education	204	73.6%
Educational Administration	3	1.1
Educational Psychology	1	0.4
Curriculum & Instruction	1	0.4
Psychology/Counseling	1	0.4
Special Education	6	2.2
Reading	3	1.1
Other	1	0.4
Blank	57	20.6

teachers have obtained masters degrees. Most of the respondents to the "major" item indicated they held an elementary education major.

The next section of the survey asked teachers to report the number of assistants assigned to them. Table 2.95 shows that while all the Montgomery teachers and all but one Stillwater teacher reported at least one aide, this assistance was provided only partially in the other districts. Few teachers in Wheaton, Hopkins, and Minnetonka were assigned aides. Most of the student teachers reported in the survey worked in the Hopkins, Minnetonka, and St. Cloud districts, very likely due to their proximity to teacher training institutions. Volunteer assistance was apparently not a major part of any district's reading program except in Stillwater, where five of the nine teachers reported at least three volunteers. Montevideo reported several "other assistants," but did not specify the nature of this assistance.

Table 2.96 lists the 37 opinion items and statistics on the overall responses of all teachers, while Table 2.97 gives the mean response of each site's teachers to each item. These findings can be summarized in a few words by stating that they indicate a very favorable overall assessment of the various aspects of the mastery learning program as implemented in their schools. All but two survey items received mean responses of at least 0.3 better than the midpoint of 2.5 (i.e., 2.8 or better for most of the items, 2.2 or less for the asterisked items, for which a low mean response represents a favorable finding). The only items which did not meet with this strong favorable response were Items 7 and 13. A total of 58.5% of the teachers disagree with the statement, "Use of the mastery learning program has resulted in smaller reading groups." This was the only item which the majority of teachers gave an unfavorable evaluation. Item 13 was the item with the next lowest mean (of the items for which a high mean was desirable), but even this item received 60% favorable responses. This item relates to parents' ability to follow their children's progress in reading.

Items 1 through 5, dealing with reading program objectives in their school and the need for an initial assessment of children's skill level, each received "strongly agree" responses by the majority of teachers. With a similar strongly favorable response, teachers agree that the computer management system provides excellent feedback for students, parents, and themselves, helps them individualize instruction, and decreases the time they must spend doing record-keeping. All but two respondents report that the administration in their district supports the mastery learning program, and 92.5% of respondents say that the mastery learning program in their district was efficiently and effectively implemented. The teachers indicate that the program has improved the reading instruction and reading ability of their students, and has improved their skills, confidence, and satisfaction in teaching.

The teacher survey form included a list of mastery learning inservice training topics and teachers were asked to check those workshops or classes which they had attended. Table 2.98 lists the

Table 2.95

TEACHER ASSISTANTS

Demonstration Site	N	Number Of Aides				Number Of Student Teachers				Number Of Volunteers				Number Of Other Assistants			
		1	2	>2	Blank Or Zero	1	2	>2	Blank Or Zero	1	2	>2	Blank Or Zero	1	2	>2	Blank Or Zero
Stillwater	9	3	-	5	1	3	-	1	5	-	-	5	4	-	-	4	5
Minnetonka	40	3	1	-	36	13	-	5	22	2	2	1	35	-	-	-	40
Hopkins	111	8	2	-	101	19	1	1	90	3	2	3	103	-	-	-	111
Montgomery	12	12	-	-	-	-	-	-	12	-	2	-	10	-	-	-	12
Wheaton	12	-	-	1	11	-	-	-	12	-	-	-	12	-	-	-	12
Staples	17	5	-	1	11	-	-	-	17	2	2	2	11	1	2	-	14
St. Cloud	36	14	3	2	17	11	3	-	22	7	6	3	20	3	1	1	31
Montevideo	21	12	-	-	9	3	-	1	17	2	2	4	13	9	-	-	12
Deer River	17	7	-	1	9	1	-	-	16	3	-	-	13	1	-	-	16
Full Sample	277	65	6	10	196	50	4	8	215	19	16	19	223	14	3	6	254

Table 2.96

FULL SAMPLE: TEACHER OPINIONS

N = 277

		Scale							
Item	Mean Response	Strongly Disagree (1) N	%	Disagree (2) N	%	Agree (3) N	%	Strongly Agree (4) N	%
1. At our school, important reading skills have been stated as measurable objectives.	3.8	1	0.4%	1	0.4%	50	18.1%	224	81.2%
2. Objectives proposed for inclusion in our reading program were critically evaluated.	3.5	2	0.7	8	2.9	105	38.5	158	57.9
3. Objectives should be identified before the students interact with the curriculum.	3.6	-	-	4	1.5	102	37.1	169	61.5
4. Sufficient time was devoted to the identification of measurable objectives.	3.5	2	0.7	12	4.4	106	38.8	153	56.0
5. An initial assessment of the child's skill level is essential.	3.6	-	-	10	3.7	84	31.1	176	65.2
6. The diagnostic tests used in the initial placement of students were effective.	3.2	8	3.5	19	8.4	130	57.5	69	30.5
7. Use of the mastery learning program has resulted in smaller reading groups.	2.4	42	17.3	100	41.2	72	29.6	29	11.9
8. The computer management system reports provide excellent feedback for teachers.	3.6	7	3.2	8	3.7	46	21.1	157	72.0
9. Correctives and extensions are in place before students begin specific units.	3.2	7	2.8	27	10.7	118	46.6	101	39.9
*10. Mastery learning requires more time in teacher preparation than other ways of teaching.	2.2	56	21.1	130	48.9	61	22.9	19	7.1

*High mean response indicates an unfavorable finding.

-144-

Table 2.96 - (cont'd)

FULL SAMPLE: TEACHER OPINIONS

N = 277

Item	Mean Response	Scale							
		Strongly Disagree (1)		Disagree (2)		Agree (3)		Strongly Agree (4)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
*11. There is a shortage of appropriate resources for students who fail to reach the criterion after an initial presentation of the lesson.	2.2	46	16.7%	142	51.4%	72	26.1%	16	5.8%
12. Reports produced through the computer management system make it easy to monitor student progress in reading.	3.5	4	1.8	15	6.8	68	31.1	132	60.3
13. Since parents can readily follow their child's progress in reading, I can focus on other important issues during parent-teacher conferences.	2.7	15	5.6	91	34.0	120	44.8	42	15.7
14. Since our school adopted the computer management system, teachers can devote more time in classroom instruction.	3.0	9	4.3	35	16.7	116	55.2	50	23.8
*15. The computer management system detracts from the teaching of reading.	1.6	100	46.5	99	46.0	11	5.1	5	2.3
16. Clear guidelines have been established for matching assessment information with alternative teaching strategies.	2.8	11	4.2	72	27.4	144	54.8	36	13.7
17. The computer management system reports provide excellent feedback for parents.	3.4	5	2.3	14	16.5	83	38.4	114	52.8
18. A common commitment by the Board, administration, and teachers to the mastery learning program has helped to ensure its success.	3.4	2	0.7	14	5.2	129	47.6	126	46.5
*19. The usefulness of the mastery learning program varies depending on the child's ability.	2.2	44	16.4	131	48.9	78	29.1	15	5.6

*High mean response indicates an unfavorable finding.

Table 2.96 - (cont'd)

FULL SAMPLE: TEACHER OPINIONS

N = 277

	Mean Response	Scale							
		Strongly Disagree (1)		Disagree (2)		Agree (3)		Strongly Agree (4)	
Item		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
20. Reading instruction in our school has been significantly improved through adoption of the mastery learning approach.	3.1	6	2.5%	32	13.2%	129	53.3%	75	31.0%
21. I can document positive change in the reading ability of students since the mastery learning program was adopted.	3.0	6	2.7	46	20.4	123	54.4	51	22.6
22. The computer management system has helped to individualize instruction.	3.2	5	2.5	22	11.1	106	53.3	66	33.2
23. I experience more satisfaction in my job as a teacher since the mastery learning program was adopted.	3.0	5	2.2	48	21.2	121	53.5	52	23.0
24. I feel more confident in my ability to teach reading since the mastery learning program was adopted.	2.9	7	3.1	59	25.8	117	51.1	46	20.1
25. Most teachers like the computer management system.	3.2	7	3.6	14	7.1	105	53.3	71	36.0
26. The mastery learning approach has broadened my definition of what it means to teach reading.	2.9	9	3.7	55	22.9	137	57.1	39	16.2
27. Clearly defined objectives ensure that the same curriculum is adopted by all elementary grade reading teachers.	3.3	7	2.7	15	5.8	137	53.3	98	38.1
*28. Work and time requirements involved in curriculum development, make mastery learning unfeasible in the long run.	1.7	92	36.4	142	56.1	14	5.5	5	2.0
29. The instructional practices utilized in mastery learning can be used to improve instruction in areas of learning other than reading.	3.2	1	0.4	12	4.7	180	69.8	65	25.2

*High mean response indicates an unfavorable finding.

Table 2.96 - (cont'd)

FULL SAMPLE: TEACHER OPINIONS

N = 277

		Scale							
		Strongly Disagree (1)		Disagree (2)		Agree (3)		Strongly Agree (4)	
Item	Mean Response	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
30. Inservice related to the mastery learning program has improved my skills in teaching reading.	2.9	10	4.1%	49	20.2%	132	54.5%	51	21.1%
31. High quality materials for enrichment and extension activities are provided for students who have demonstrated a mastery of a specific skill.	3.0	12	4.7	49	19.3	131	51.6	62	24.4
32. The computer management system reports provide excellent feedback for students.	3.3	9	4.6	14	7.1	89	45.2	85	43.1
33. There are high quality materials available for re-teaching activities for students not mastering a specific skill after initial presentation.	2.8	14	5.4	76	29.2	129	49.6	41	15.8
34. Teachers spend less time in the recordkeeping process in mastery learning than in a conventional classroom.	3.0	17	6.7	60	23.5	95	37.3	83	32.5
35. The administration in the district is supportive of the mastery learning program.	3.5	-	-	2	0.8	116	44.6	142	54.6
36. The mastery learning program in this school district has been effectively and efficiently implemented.	3.4	4	1.6	15	5.9	108	42.5	127	50.0
37. Regular meetings are conducted to plan and keep people informed in regard to the project.	3.0	14	5.5	28	10.9	146	57.0	68	26.6

*High mean response indicates an unfavorable finding.

Table 2.97

TEACHER OPINIONS - MEAN RESPONSE BY ITEM BY SCHOOL AND OVERALL

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10*	11*	12	13	14	15*	16	17	18	19*	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27
Stillwater	4.0	3.9	2.9	3.4	3.3	3.0	1.7	2.9	3.4	2.1	1.6	2.8	2.7	2.3	1.7	3.1	3.2	3.2	2.1	2.7	2.4	3.0	2.5	2.8	2.7	2.7	2.6
Minnetonka	3.7	3.0	3.6	3.0	3.4	2.7	1.9	2.5	3.0	2.5	2.6	2.6	2.1	2.1	2.1	2.3	2.2	2.9	2.5	2.7	2.8	2.2	2.5	2.7	1.7	2.5	2.9
Hopkins	3.9	3.7	3.6	3.8	3.8	3.4	2.5	3.8	3.6	1.7	2.0	3.7	3.0	3.2	1.4	3.0	3.6	3.7	2.1	3.2	3.0	3.4	3.1	2.9	3.4	2.9	3.5
Montgomery	3.8	3.7	3.8	3.5	3.8	3.3	2.5	3.9	3.1	2.8	2.3	3.3	2.6	3.3	1.7	2.6	3.7	3.8	2.3	3.8	3.4	3.5	3.6	3.6	3.7	3.3	3.3
Wheaton	3.7	3.4	3.8	3.3	3.5	3.0	3.2	4.0	3.1	3.0	2.0	3.8	2.8	2.9	1.7	3.0	3.8	3.5	1.8	3.1	2.8	3.5	3.1	3.3	3.4	3.1	3.1
Staples	3.6	3.2	3.4	2.9	3.6	3.0	2.3	3.8	3.2	2.0	2.4	3.6	2.9	3.2	1.5	2.8	3.2	3.1	2.5	3.0	3.9	3.0	3.0	3.1	3.3	2.6	3.1
St. Cloud	3.8	3.6	3.9	3.4	3.5	3.2	1.8	3.5	2.3	2.6	2.7	3.2	2.6	2.7	1.8	2.5	3.4	3.3	2.2	3.2	3.0	2.9	2.9	2.8	3.1	3.1	3.2
Montevideo	3.9	3.8	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.3	3.3	3.8	3.6	2.3	2.1	3.8	2.6	3.3	2.2	3.1	3.2	3.2	2.6	3.6	3.2	3.2	3.3	3.3	3.2	3.1	3.5
Deer River	3.6	3.4	3.6	3.4	3.6	2.5	2.2	3.2	2.9	2.1	2.5	3.2	2.5	2.6	1.9	2.4	2.9	2.9	2.5	2.5	2.6	3.0	2.0	1.8	3.0	2.4	2.6
Full Sample	3.8	3.5	3.6	3.5	3.6	3.2	2.4	3.6	3.2	2.2	2.2	3.5	2.7	3.0	1.6	2.8	3.4	3.4	2.2	3.1	3.0	3.2	3.0	2.9	3.2	2.9	3.3

	28*	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37
Stillwater	1.7	3.6	2.4	3.2	3.0	3.3	2.8	3.3	2.6	2.9
Minnetonka	2.0	3.0	2.5	2.7	1.9	2.0	2.2	3.3	2.9	2.2
Hopkins	1.5	3.2	3.1	3.3	3.5	3.0	3.5	3.8	3.8	3.4
Montgomery	1.7	3.3	2.9	2.8	3.4	2.8	3.3	3.8	3.6	3.4
Wheaton	2.0	3.0	3.1	3.2	3.3	3.1	2.7	3.5	3.7	3.3
Staples	1.7	3.1	2.9	2.4	3.2	2.5	3.3	3.3	3.0	2.9
St. Cloud	1.9	3.2	2.8	2.3	3.2	2.4	1.9	3.3	3.1	2.9
Montevideo	2.0	3.3	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.1	3.0	3.3	3.4	3.1
Deer River	2.3	3.0	2.1	2.8	3.0	2.7	3.3	3.3	2.9	2.6
Full Sample	1.7	3.2	2.9	3.0	3.3	2.8	3.0	3.5	3.4	3.0

*High mean response indicates an unfavorable finding.

Table 2.98

FULL SAMPLE: TEACHER SURVEY - INSERVICE DATA

N = 277

Inservice Training	N	%*
Developing objectives	58	20.9%
Writing test items	42	15.2
Computer management system	104	37.5
Mastery learning program goals, objectives, definition	151	54.5
Instructional techniques/strategies related to reading	126	45.5
Correctives development and/or use	92	33.2
Extensions development and/or use	107	38.6
Mastery learning programs in other districts	56	20.2
Correlating resources to objectives	83	30.0

*Percentages do not add to 100% due to multiple responses.

types of training and the survey findings. At least 20% of the
respondents had attended all but one of the types of training. A
total of 151 teachers, or 54.5%, reported having training in mastery
learning program goals, objectives, and definition. Over 100
teachers received training in each of these areas: instructional
techniques/strategies related to reading, extensions development
and/or use, and the computer management system.

The last items of the teacher survey were open-ended questions
asking respondents their views of the major strengths and weaknesses
of mastery learning. Table 2.99 summarizes the most common strengths
noted by the teachers.

The strength mentioned by the most teachers (99) is the feedback
provided by the mastery learning program. Teachers usually elaborated
on this statement. Some remarked on the benefits of feedback to
parents of how their children are doing, or the benefit to the
students. Others remarked that the feedback was "specific" and
"diagnostic," enabling them to tailor corrective instruction to
students' specific weaknesses.

Mentioned next most frequently as a strength was "recordkeeping"
(59 teachers). Several teachers said that the computerized record-
keeping freed some of their time from "bookkeeping" duties, giving
them more time to prepare lessons.

Other strengths reported by teachers represent some of the
main tenets of the mastery learning philosophy, namely, "students
attain mastery of reading objectives;" "specific objectives" (several
also said fewer objectives); and "individualized instruction." Other
strengths frequently reported include: good corrective and/or extension
materials; improved student self-esteem; computerized test correction,
and consistent reading programs from one grade to the next, or within
the classrooms of the same grade level in the school district.

The most commonly-listed weaknesses of mastery learning from
the full sample of teachers are summarized in Table 2.100. Twenty
respondents noted a need for more corrective and/or extension
materials. Eighteen teachers remarked that teaching reading using
the mastery learning approach takes more time in preparation. Their
comments suggest that this is a problem in the initial implementation
of the mastery learning program which may diminish after it has
been in place for awhile and activities, worksheets, etc. have been
developed. Some teachers also qualified their statement by saying
that the extra time spent was outweighed by the benefits to the
students.

Ten teachers noted faulty test items as a weakness. Their
comments generally indicated that these were scattered occurrences.
Five teachers said that too much class time is spent testing when
using mastery learning.

The "weaknesses" mentioned above were noted by teachers in more
than one school district. There were other weaknesses mentioned by

Table 2.99
TEACHER SURVEY - FULL SAMPLE
MASTERY LEARNING STRENGTHS

Number Of Occurrences	Strength
99	Feedback
59	Record-keeping
24	Students attain mastery of reading objectives
21	Specific objectives
19	Individualized instruction
17	Corrective/extension materials
17	Enhanced student self-esteem; positive attitude toward reading
15	Computer test correction
15	Consistent reading program across grades and/or across classrooms in district
10	Small groups/organizing reading groups
8	Computer printouts

Table 2.100
TEACHER SURVEY: FULL SAMPLE
MASTERY LEARNING WEAKNESSES

Number Of Occurrences	Weakness
20	More corrective/extension materials needed
18	More teacher preparation time required
10	Faulty test items
5	Too much class time spent testing

teachers in only one district, suggesting a problem which is unique to the one district. For example, some Minnetonka teachers found fault with their textbook series. Some St. Cloud teachers found that they were doing a lot of "bookkeeping" and paperwork, because the computer management system was not yet fully implemented. Some Hopkins teachers listed as a weakness that parents didn't understand the computer printouts, so the teachers had to take time to explain them.

In general, teachers found fewer weaknesses than strengths, but there was a greater diversity of weaknesses noted by one or a few teachers. Many teachers said there were no weaknesses or left this item blank. One teacher made an insightful comment distinguishing weaknesses in the mastery learning philosophy from weaknesses or difficulties of school personnel in implementing the program. This teacher mentioned the need to revise tests and improve resources as examples of the latter type of problem, and indicated that her district could correct these shortcomings.

III.   SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

EMS/McGraw-Hill administered parent, student, and teacher surveys at the ten mastery learning demonstration sites, listed below based on funding category:

Exemplary	Differentiated Staffing	Start-Up
Deer River	Staples	Minneapolis (only
Hopkins	Stillwater	student survey
Minnetonka		data was collected)
Montevideo		Montgomery
St. Cloud		Wheaton

1) **Parent Survey**

o 1,504 parents from the demonstration sites completed the parent survey; its three sections provided data on the parents' demographic characteristics, their involvement in their school's reading program, and opinions concerning their child's reading and the school reading program.

o Over 65% of parents in the suburban sites (Hopkins, Minnetonka, Stillwater) have had college education; less than half of the parents in the rural districts have had this level of education.

o Parents in the suburban districts have fewer children in school, on average, than rural parents. The overall average number of children in school per family, based on parents survey responses, is 2.1.

o 88 percent of parents indicated that they "work with (their) child to complete homework assignments; " 80% attend conferences with their child's reading teacher. Each of the other modes of involvement listed on the survey form were checked by less than one-third of the parents.

o The parents responded to 24 reading-related statements to express their level of agreement or disagreement with the item using the following scale: (1) strongly disagree, (2) disagree, (3) agree, (4) strongly agree. The items were written so that "strongly agree" is the most desirable rating in each case.

o Parent responses to the opinion items were very positive, overall - over 70% of all parents "agreed" or "strongly agreed" with all but two of the survey items; mean responses were generally quite high for these survey items, in the 2.9 to 3.5 range.

2) Student Survey

o 3,127 students from the ten sites completed the student survey. Almost 90% of these were first, second, or third graders; most of the demonstration sites had a roughly even distribution of respondents according to these grade levels. Fourth graders and kindergarten students comprised most of the remaining student respondents.

o The survey consisted of seventeen short statements about reading and reading class to which students were to respond "yes" or "no."

o The students overall had positive attitudes toward reading and their reading class; for each item the majority of students responded favorably. Eight items received a favorable response from 85% or more of the students, including "I like to read," "I read well," "I read at home," "My reading class is too hard" (over 85% said "no"), "My reading class is fun," "I know what I am supposed to do in reading class," "I know what I need to work on in reading," and "Reading well is important."

o The item with the largest unfavorable response and thus the most room for improvement is "My reading class is too easy;" 46.7% of the students answered "yes" to this item.

3) Teacher Survey

o The teacher survey collected information on the teachers' educational background, experience, assistants, mastery learning training, and their views of mastery learning's strengths and weaknesses. It also included 37 students to which teachers expressed their disagreement or agreement on the same 1-4 scale as was used for the parent survey.

o 277 elementary teachers, representing all demonstration sites except Minneapolis, completed the survey. 111 teachers, 40% of the overall sample, were from the Hopkins site. About two-thirds of them teach exclusively in one or more of the grades from kindergarten through third grade.

o Many experienced teachers were included among the survey respondents - nearly 60% have over 15 years of teaching experience. Just over half of the teachers surveyed have taught in their present district for more than 15 years.

o Elementary education was the major of nearly all teachers who
   completed this item. One-fifth of the teachers report
   masters degrees.

o Nearly all Montgomery and Stillwater teachers had at least
   one aide assigned to them; this assistance was provided only
   partially or rarely in the other districts. Volunteer
   assistance apparently was not a major part of any district's
   reading program except for Stillwater. Most of the student
   teachers reported by the respondents worked in the Hopkins,
   Minnetonka, and St. Cloud districts.

o The overall teacher response to the opinion items represents
   a highly favorable assessment of the various aspects of the
   mastery learning reading program as implemented in their
   schools. Mean responses for all but two survey items were
   at least 0.3 better than the midpont of 2.5.

o The only item which was answered unfavorably by a majority
   of the teachers was "Use of the mastery learning program
   has resulted in smaller reading groups;" 58.5% "disagreed"
   or "strongly disagreed" with this statement.

o The majority of respondents "strongly agreed" with nine of
   the survey items. These teachers report that in their
   school they have implemented carefully planned, measurable
   objectives for their reading program; they believe an initial
   assessment of a child's skill level is essential; they feel
   the computer management system reports provide excellent
   feedback for parents and themselves; and they strongly agree
   that their district's administration is supportive of the
   mastery learning program.

o A large majority of teachers agreed with each of the
   following items, indicating they felt that using the mastery
   learning program was a rewarding and beneficial experience
   for themselves and their students:

   - Reading instruction in our school has been significantly
     improved through adoption of the mastery learning approach.

   - I can document positive change in the reading ability of
     students since the mastery learning program was adopted.

   - The computer management system has helped to individualize
     instruction.

   - I experience more satisfaction in my job as a teacher since
     the mastery learning program was adopted.

   - I feel more confident in my ability to teach reading since
     the mastery learning program was adopted.

   - Most teachers like the computer management system.

o Teachers have received training in many aspects of the mastery learning program; at least 20% of those surveyed reported training in eight of the nine facets of the program listed in the survey. The largest percentage of teachers (54.5%) reported having training in "mastery learning program goals, objectives, and definition."

o Teachers were asked to identify the major strengths and weaknesses of mastery learning. Strengths noted most frequently were the feedback provided by the program and its record-keeping advantages. Most frequently-cited weaknesses were the need for more corrective and extension materials, and the increased teacher preparation time required using the mastery learning program.

APPENDIX A

PARENT SURVEY

PARENT SURVEY

Formal Education Completed by Mother (circle one):

   8th Grade or less   HS Diploma   College   Masters   PhD

Formal Education Completed by Father (circle one):

   8th Grade or less   HS Diploma   College   Masters   PhD

Mother's Occupation _____   Father's Occupation _____

Number of children presently in school _____

Please indicate what involvement you have had in the reading program at your school.
(Check all items that apply)

____   Work with my child to complete homework assignments.

____   Attend conferences with my child's reading teacher.

____   Attend meetings or workshops related to the mastery learning reading program.

____   Observe children during reading instruction.

____   Supervise students at school while they work on assignments.

____   Help to develop or organize curriculum/resource materials.

____   Work as a volunteer aide.

____   Work as a paid instructional aide.

____   Provide classroom instruction.

____   Provide input in decision making and policy.

____   Participate through a Parent Advisory Committee.

____   Other: Please specify _____

_____

_____

_____

		Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Agree (3)	Strongly Agree (4)	Does Not Apply (NA)
1.	It is easy for me to follow my child's progress in reading.	1	2	3	4	NA
2.	Reports produced through the computer management system were discussed during parent-teacher conferences.	1	2	3	4	NA
3.	I am regularly informed of the number and percentage of objectives my child attains in reading.	1	2	3	4	NA
4.	I am in regular contact with my child's teacher/teachers about his/her reading.	1	2	3	4	NA
5.	Materials are made available that I can use at home to help my child read.	1	2	3	4	NA
6.	Since the mastery learning program was started, I feel more involved in my child's reading.	1	2	3	4	NA
7.	I read stories to my child at home.	1	2	3	4	NA
8.	I talk with my child about the stories we read.	1	2	3	4	NA
9.	I encourage my children to make up their own stories.	1	2	3	4	NA
10.	I have more contact with my child's teacher/teachers since the mastery learning program was implemented.	1	2	3	4	NA
11.	Someone at the school has explained why my child was placed at their current level in reading.	1	2	3	4	NA
12.	I understand how reading is taught in the mastery learning reading program.	1	2	3	4	NA
13.	Reports produced through the computer management system make it easier to monitor my child's progress in reading.	1	2	3	4	NA
14.	I carefully follow my child's progress in reading.	1	2	3	4	NA
15.	Through the computer management reports, I have become more aware of my child's reading skills.	1	2	3	4	NA
16.	If my child masters all the objectives identified in the computer management report, then the instructional program is appropriate.	1	2	3	4	NA
17.	An objective of the reading program at our school is to stimulate a desire to read on the part of every child.	1	2	3	4	NA
18.	I talk with my child about his/her reading assignments.	1	2	3	4	NA
19.	If my child is not reading at a level I find acceptable, I increase the amount of time my child works on reading at home.	1	2	3	4	NA
20.	I limit the amount of time my child spends watching TV.	1	2	3	4	NA
21.	Teachers know what interests my child.	1	2	3	4	NA
22.	Reading instruction in our school has been significantly improved through adoption of the mastery learning approach.	1	2	3	4	NA
23.	My child enjoys reading.	1	2	3	4	NA
24.	My child reads library books on a regular basis.	1	2	3	4	NA

APPENDIX B

STUDENT SURVEY

STUDENT SURVEY

Student Name _____   Grade Level _____

School _____

	YES	NO

1. I like to read.

2. I read well.

3. I read at home.

4. In reading class, someone is always there to help me.

5. My reading class is too hard.

6. My reading class is fun.

7. I know how well I am doing in reading.

8. There are too many tests in my reading class.

9. My reading class is boring.

10. I know how well other students can read.

11. My friends all read well.

12. I avoid students who don't read well.

13. My reading class is too easy.

14. I know what I am supposed to do in my reading class.

15. I read library books more often than last year.

16. I know what I need to work on in reading.

17. Reading well is important.

APPENDIX C

TEACHER SURVEY

MASTERY LEARNING PROGRAM

TEACHER SURVEY

Name_____   School_____

Grade Level(s)_____

PART I:

Years Experience as a Teacher_____   Years in District_____   Years in Grade_____   Years Teaching Reading_____

Experience with Differentiated Staffing _____Years   Experience with the Mastery Learning Approach _____Years

Highest Degree Earned: _____   Major(s) _____

Number of assistants
assigned to you:

		Number of Weeks	Hours Per Week
Aides_____		_____	_____
Student Teachers_____		_____	_____
Volunteers_____		_____	_____
Other_____		_____	_____

PART II:

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Agree (3)	Strongly Agree (4)	Does Not Apply (NA)
1. At our school, important reading skills have been stated as measurable objectives.	1	2	3	4	NA
2. Objectives proposed for inclusion in our reading program were critically evaluated.	1	2	3	4	NA
3. Objectives should be identified before the students interact with the curriculum.	1	2	3	4	NA
4. Sufficient time was devoted to the identification of measurable objectives.	1	2	3	4	NA
5. An initial assessment of the child's skill level is essential.	1	2	3	4	NA
6. The diagnostic tests used in the initial placement of students were effective.	1	2	3	4	NA
7. Use of the mastery learning program has resulted in smaller reading groups.	1	2	3	4	NA
8. The computer management system reports provide excellent feedback for teachers.	1	2	3	4	NA
9. Correctives and extensions are in place before students begin specific units.	1	2	3	4	NA
10. Mastery learning requires more time in teacher preparation than other ways of teaching.	1	2	3	4	NA
11. There is a shortage of appropriate resources for students who fail to reach the criterion after an initial presentation of the lesson.	1	2	3	4	NA
12. Reports produced through the computer management system make it easy to monitor student progress in reading.	1	2	3	4	NA
13. Since parents can readily follow their child's progress in reading, I can focus on other important issues during parent-teacher conferences.	1	2	3	4	NA
14. Since our school adopted the computer management system, teachers can devote more time in classroom instruction.	1	2	3	4	NA
15. The computer management system detracts from the teaching of reading.	1	2	3	4	NA
16. Clear guidelines have been established for matching assessment information with alternative teaching strategies.	1	2	3	4	NA
17. The computer management system reports provide excellent feedback for parents.	1	2	3	4	NA
18. A common commitment by the Board, administration, and teachers to the mastery learning program has helped to ensure its success.	1	2	3	4	NA
19. The usefulness of the mastery learning program varies depending on the child's ability.	1	2	3	4	NA

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Agree (3)	Strongly Agree (4)	Does Not Apply (NA)
20. Reading instruction in our school has been significantly improved through adoption of the mastery learning approach.	1	2	3	4	
21. I can document positive change in the reading ability of students since the mastery learning program was adopted.	1	2	3	4	NA
22. The computer management system has helped to individualize instruction.	1	2	3	4	NA
23. I experience more satisfaction in my job as a teacher since the mastery learning program was adopted.	1	2	3	4	NA
24. I feel more confident in my ability to teach reading since the mastery learning program was adopted.	1	2	3	4	NA
25. Most teachers like the computer management system.	1	2	3	4	NA
26. The mastery learning approach has broadened my definition of what it means to teach reading.	1	2	3	4	NA
27. Clearly defined objectives ensure that the same curriculum is adopted by all elementary grade reading teachers.	1	2	3	4	NA
28. Work and time requirements involved in curriculum development, make mastery learning unfeasible in the long run.	1	2	3	4	NA
29. The instructional practices utilized in mastery learning can be used to improve instruction in areas of learning other than reading.	1	2	3	4	NA
30. Inservice related to the mastery learning program has improved my skills in teaching reading.	1	2	3	4	NA
31. High quality materials for enrichment and extension activities are provided for students who have demonstrated a mastery of a specific skill.	1	2	3	4	NA
32. The computer management system reports provide excellent feedback for students.	1	2	3	4	NA
33. There are high quality materials available for re-teaching activities for students not mastering a specific skill after initial presentation.	1	2	3	4	NA
34. Teachers spend less time in the recordkeeping process in mastery learning than in a conventional classroom.	1	2	3	4	NA
35. The administration in the district is supportive of the mastery learning program.	1	2	3	4	
36. The mastery learning program in this school district has been effectively and efficiently implemented.	1	2	3	4	NA
37. Regular meetings are conducted to plan and keep people informed in regard to the project.	1	2	3	4	NA

38. What classes, workshops and inservice training were you involved in that related to mastery learning? (Check those that apply)

    ____Developing objectives
    ____Writing test items
    ____Computer management system
    ____Mastery learning program goals, objectives, definition
    ____Instructional techniques and strategies related to reading
    ____Correctives development and/or use
    ____Extensions development and/or use
    ____Mastery learning programs in other districts
    ____Correlating resources to objectives
    ____Other (Please indicate)

39. What are the major strengths of mastery learning?

40. What are the major weaknesses of mastery learning?