

Title I Extended Year Summer Camp Program Evaluation

Research and Accountability

Pinellas County Schools

October 2009

Introduction

The purpose of this report is to describe the structure and the participants' perceptions of the first year of the Extended Year Title I Summer Camp Program and to make recommendations for future summer camp programs. The perspectives of the educators involved in this program and a review of literature provide a preliminary understanding of the potential benefits of a summer camp program.

The sections of this report:

1. Share related literature
2. Describe the planning and implementation of the initial Pinellas County Schools 2009 Title I Extended Year Summer Camp Program for students and the related Extended Year Summer Camp Professional Development Program for teachers
3. Report the perceived effectiveness of the programs
4. Make recommendations for future camp programs

Evaluation Study Design

This study uses quantitative and qualitative research methods to analyze data obtained through two online surveys, observations of seven camp sites, and interviews with the Director of Title I, curriculum coaches, and teachers. Student achievement data was not consistently available. Pretest and posttest data was provided by nine camp sites and most sites showed some positive results, however the test data was not collected systematically and its validity could not be verified.

Approach

The following data sources were used in this report:

1. Initial e-mail interview with the Director of Title I, Mary Conage
2. An online survey of 104 camp teachers
3. An online survey of 14 camp curriculum coaches
4. Observations of student camp and professional development sessions at Lakewood, Maximo, Fairmount Park, Melrose, Eisenhower, Sandy Lane, and Walsingham Elementary Schools.
5. Interviews with principals, teachers, and coaches at the above-mentioned schools
6. Selected documents related to summer learning (see references)

Related Literature

A phenomenon called the "summer slide," or the loss of academic skills during the summer vacation from school, has been well documented in research for decades. In the article, "Summer Learning – Moving from the Periphery to the Core," The Education Commission of the States (2009) reports that while middle and upper income students typically make slight gains in reading achievement over the

summer, economically disadvantaged students typically lose more than two months in reading achievement each summer. These gains and losses accumulate over time, expanding the skill gap between these groups of children.

In their article, “Summer Can Set Kids on the Right – or Wrong – Course,” The Center for Summer Learning at Johns Hopkins University (2008) reports that about two-thirds of the academic achievement gap between disadvantaged youngsters and their more advantaged peers can be explained by what happens over the summer. The Center found that even though low-income children often begin the school year with lower achievement scores than their middle and upper-income peers, they progress at about the same rate. In the summer, when many affluent children gain skills from reading library books, traveling, and engaging in organized activities, many lower-income children are less stimulated and suffer a disproportionate loss of skills.

The National Center for Summer Learning reports that effective summer programs created for low-income students can have a positive impact on this learning loss and skill gap. In the article, “What Makes a Summer Learning Program Effective,” the Center outlines six characteristics of effective summer programs:

- Strong leadership
- Careful planning
- Extensive staff development
- Strategic partnerships
- Continual evaluation
- Focus on sustainability

The Education Commission of the States (2009) further defines the Center's research-based vision for an ideal summer school program in the following chart:

What does a new vision for summer school look like?

1. Increase the duration and intensity of the traditional summer school model to a comprehensive research-based, six-week, full-day model.
2. Expand participation from only those students struggling academically to all students in school-wide Title I programs.
3. Change the focus from narrow remediation and test preparation to a blended approach of both academic learning in core subject areas and hands-on activities that foster critical 21st century skills like collaboration, innovation, creativity, communication and data analysis.
4. Strengthen and expand partnerships with community-based organizations.
5. Provide incentives to students that improve attendance and engagement by making enrichment activities such as arts, music, sports, and free breakfast and lunch through the federal Summer Food program.
6. Provide innovative professional development for educators and ensure summer programs offer teachers a chance to test new models of teaching and gain valuable leadership experience.
7. Summers need to move from the periphery to the center of school reform strategies through better planning, infrastructure, data collection and accountability.

(Education Commission of the States, from the National Center for Summer Learning, 2009, p.2)

Planning and Implementation of the Pinellas County Schools Title I Extended Year Summer Camp Program

A Title I School Improvement Initiative (SII) Grant funded the Camp Program. The grant required recipients to implement programs designed to increase the academic achievement of non-proficient students (as defined by the Florida Comprehensive Achievement Test) who attend the lowest achieving Title I schools. SII funds must support activities that are designed to help struggling Title I schools meet the progress goals in their school improvement plans.

All 21 Pinellas County Title I schools designated by No Child Left Behind as needing improvement for four or more years (School in Need of Improvement or SINI 4+) in the 2007-2008 school year were selected as camp sites. This included four SINI 4 schools, fourteen SINI 5 schools, and one SINI 6 school. In an effort to increase student achievement by improving both the skills of students and teachers, the camp program was designed in two parts: a morning program for students and an afternoon professional development program for teachers. Goals for the camp

program included providing students with remediation and enrichment in areas of academic weakness, minimizing summer learning loss, and providing Title I teachers with context-based professional development experiences that would support their practice in the upcoming school year.

The camp operated for 14 days, from June 8-30th at 21 Title I elementary school sites primarily located in the southern half of Pinellas County. Session times varied, but all students were required to attend camp for a minimum of three hours per day. Most sites held sessions for students from 8:30 – 11:30 A.M., followed by daily professional development and planning sessions for teachers from 12:30-3:30 P.M. Students were not provided with transportation to and from camp and were not enrolled in the camp program after the morning session.

With less than one month to prepare, each of the 21 school principals was asked to select eight teachers to work at their camp, organize a leadership team to design or select curricula, and design a plan to invite students.

Principals used various procedures and strategies when selecting camp teachers, including:

- A formal application and interview procedure
- Awarding positions to all interested teachers on a first-come, first-served basis
- Choosing only the strongest performing teachers
- Pairing strong and developing teachers in teaching teams

School staff developers and Title I coaches formed the core of leadership teams at each school site. Leadership teams were asked to identify subgroups of students that did not make Annual Yearly Progress in the 2007-2008 school year (2008-2009 data was not yet available) and craft a 14-day curriculum to address their documented weaknesses in math, reading, writing, and/or science.

Each team had considerable autonomy to develop a model that fit the needs of their students and teachers. Although all sites were asked to administer some form of comparative assessment on the first and last days of camp, only nine (43%) of the 21 camp sites reported results to the Title I director and evaluator as requested. Assessments varied; some schools probed the self-confidence or attitudes of students before and after camp with teacher designed questionnaires, while others used a short skill inventories like dictation surveys, Quick Reads, or the McMillan Placement Test, to assess change.

The student selection process also varied widely. With a recommended teacher-pupil ratio (TPR) of 10:1, some teams methodically targeted their lowest achieving students with letters and phone calls, while others opened enrollment to their entire school population (often in response to low initial enrollment of struggling students). In addition to inviting struggling students, one school invited its gifted students to participate in a camp program for high achieving students. The only

groups of students that were uniformly excluded from this camp program were retained third graders, who attended the District's Summer Reading Camp in an effort to meet the promotion criteria. 64% of teachers reported that on most days the student-teacher ratio in their camp classrooms was 4-6, and 93% of teachers reported that the number of students per teacher in their classrooms was appropriate. Based on the reported typical teacher-pupil ratios in the online teacher survey, it is estimated that the camp program served approximately 950-1000 students.

The afternoon professional development sessions were also planned and implemented by the leadership team at each school. Teams were encouraged to focus their teacher training on areas of perceived need: math, science, and/or reading. Some schools chose to study popular books like John Van de Wall's book, *Teaching Student-Centered Mathematics* and Silver, Strong, and Perini's book, *The Strategic Teacher: Selecting the Right Research-Based Strategy for Every Lesson*. Many sites reviewed teaching strategies like the Architecture of the Mini Lesson, Higher-Level Questioning, and Accountable Talk. Beyond these common threads however, the format and structure of the professional development sessions varied considerably.

Perceived Effectiveness of the Extended Year Title I Camp Program

Teachers and curriculum coaches were asked to complete one of two anonymous, electronic surveys on either of the last two days of camp, June 29th or 30th. One hundred teachers (approximately 60% of the 168 participating teachers) completed a survey of 25 multiple choice or short answer questions about many aspects of the camp for students and the professional development sessions for teachers. The results from the teacher survey are available in Appendix A of this report. Fourteen curriculum coaches (67% of 21 coaches) completed an 11-item, short answer survey. This survey was largely focused on the development and effectiveness of curriculum. These results are summarized in Section 3.

A majority of teachers reported that the camp program was well designed and implemented; 93% felt their school's staff selection process was effective, 84% felt the student selection process was effective, and 92% felt they were able to manage and deliver the camp curriculum in 14 days. A majority of teachers reported that they had access to important instructional materials; 88% said they had adequate access to the materials and technology tools they needed to plan and deliver lessons and 90% said their students had adequate access to appropriate books for sustained independent reading.

84% of teachers said the length of the student day was appropriate and 83% said the length of the teacher day was appropriate. 61% of teachers said that on most days they had a ratio of 4-6 students per teacher, which many teachers later cited as an attribute that positively affected learning. 7% of the teachers reported they typically had 10 or more students per teacher (the original goal of the camp), suggesting that many sites had fewer students than planned.

Teacher sentiments regarding the perceived value of a low student-teacher ratio are illustrated by the following selected responses to the request: “Please share your thoughts about the effect of the student-teacher ratio on the quality of the educational experience for the children in your camp classroom”:

A low student/teacher ratio means more time with each student. This gives the teacher a better understanding of the child's needs. Small groups consist of 2 or 3 students instead of 5 or 6 - There is SOOOO much more you can do! The best part is that the children feel more important. They don't have to compete with 17 other children for your attention, your assistance, or your love.

Students were able to receive instruction in a much smaller group. Lessons were able to be focused on student needs. More individualized instruction was able to be given. Behavior was much more manageable with what had been a rather tough group of students to manage behaviorally during the school-year.

While it would have been great for more children to have the benefit of attending camp, the T/S ratio made it extremely intimate. We were really able to focus on the few children we worked with and capitalize on their strengths and weaknesses.

Despite their appreciation of the low teacher-student ratio at camp, several teachers expressed concern that the number of campers was too low and the camp program would have more impact if it served more children.

The students were selected based on fcat scores which was effective however advertisement for the program could have been more successful. I would love to have seen many more students attend.

I wish we had been able to get more students involved in the camp. It was a great experience for those who participated.

The survey requested suggestions for increasing the number of students who attend camp (especially struggling students). Of the 74 respondents, 22 (30%) suggested advertising the camps earlier, 22 (30%) recommended offering/arranging transportation, and 16 (22%) suggested offering or arranging before/after care. Most teachers had all of the materials and technology tools they needed, but 11 reported they had no Internet service or working computers. Five teachers said they needed more time to order materials before camp began.

When asked if they felt the camp curriculum seemed to meet the needs of students in their camp class, 88% percent responded “Consistently” and 12% responded “Sometimes.”

Responses to questions about the professional development sessions were generally positive. 91% of the teachers who responded said the summer camp professional development sessions will impact their instructional practice this fall and 91% said they made a significant impact on their instructional practices during camp (71% said “Yes, a Lot” and 20% said “Yes, a Little”). When asked which sessions impacted their instructional practice during camp, 8 respondents replied “Technology Integration/SMART Board training” and 8 responded “Professional Learning in Context (learn a new strategy, practice the next day with students, reflect on practice with peers). When asked which sessions will impact instructional practices in the fall, 16 teachers responded “Mathematics instruction (questioning, talk

moves, examining student work)", 15 indicated "Word work (phonics, vocabulary)," and 9 indicated "Technology integration (Moodle, SMART Board, FCAT Explorer)." When polled about their ongoing professional development needs, 51 teachers indicated "Higher Level Questioning" and 44 responded "Integration of Technology into Curriculum."

The curriculum coaches echoed many of the teachers' perceptions. The coaches generally agreed with the teachers in their support of the design and implementation of the camp programs. They appreciated the low teacher/student ratios, the opportunities to collaborate with teachers during professional development sessions, and the opportunity to explore new curriculum. Interviews with coaches at Sandy Lane, Lakewood, Maximo, Fairmount Park, and Walsingham confirm these general findings.

The curriculum coordinator's survey asked, "What observations or data suggest that the camp was or was not effective?" Many coaches described student enthusiasm, increased self-confidence, and better reading fluency as indicators of effectiveness. The following selected comments describe the observations and data gathered by coaches that contribute to their sentiments about the effectiveness of the camp program at their schools:

Vocabulary: we saw students using the new vocabulary and noticing it in new text; partner work: after the 1st day or so, we saw students knee to knee, eye to eye, listening to what the other was saying; applying strategies: while conferring, we observed the students attempting to use the strategies. We also heard students making connections - text to text; text to movies; text to self. Also, the student survey we did indicated that they liked the camp and would attend next summer.

Effective... attitudes of kids and teachers. Not effective... Not long enough. We just got started and it was over.

Our phonics surveys pre and post assessment show overall improvement of our students on the phonics level. Students were excited through out the program, and were always on task when observed. Teachers felt that the program was very effective in the students' performance.

At the end of each online survey, the teachers and curriculum coaches were invited to share any additional reflections and or suggestions regarding any part of the camp program. Responses were varied and included many overarching perspectives about the value and potential of the camp program. The following selected comments illustrate various perspectives:

The positive motivation, organization and enthusiasm of our Camp Director trickled down from the top, to the teachers, and most importantly, the students. Kids were writing up a storm in their math/science journals, sharing learning experiences with each other, and demonstrating a real understanding of the subject areas we were exploring. I heard many positive comments from both students and parents.

Examples:

"Mrs. _____, why can't we have camp on Friday?"

"I came early (7:30) because I couldn't wait to see what we were learning today!" (Camp began at 8:00)

From a parent, "Why is the camp only 3 weeks? The kids are enjoying it so much."

From a parent, "_____ keeps coming home in the afternoon asking if we have all of the materials he used at camp so he could recreate the science experiment you did."

"I made the 'Seeing Sound' experiment at home! It worked there too!"

Although I enjoyed my experience, I wish that there had been more structured guidelines in the planning stages. I felt that AFTER the planning was complete and half way through camp, Title I area supervisors voiced concerns. Had those concerns/guidelines been made clear up front, the planning would have reflected their wishes.

I have nothing negative to say about the program. Honestly, it was one of the most useful professional development times that I have had in teaching. The information was very useful and presented in an interesting way. It was also very nice to be presented the information, and then to actually be able to apply it in the classroom the very next day. We had a high level of support from our trainers, and the staff. (Our principal) did a wonderful job of choosing a group of positive ladies that wanted to be there to learn, and to help the students reach their individual goals in learning. It was a wonderful experience in everyway, and I am so thankful to have had the opportunity.

This program should be required for any student that continues to struggle throughout the year and has not made adequate progress to meet the expectations by the end of the year. PCS should begin to implement this as part of a new "Year Round" schooling model so the students that struggle have time to catch-up. I think the program should be two weeks longer though - to help meet our goals.

Recommendations for Future Camp Programs

Based on the cited research and the results of this study, the following changes would likely improve the Extended Year Title I Summer Camp program:

- 1. Strong Centralized Leadership:** Although school personnel valued the empowerment and flexibility they experienced in the first year of this camp program, future leadership teams should be provided with additional guidelines that reflect the goals of the camp program. Teacher and student selection processes, curricular options, assessment tools, and professional development topics should be standardized to enhance fidelity and produce valid data to monitor quality.
- 2. Expanded Duration, Participation, and Breadth:** The camp program should be increased from a three-week, half-day program to a six-week, full day program. Camp invitations should be extended to all students who

attend Title I schools, not just targeted subgroups of students in the schools that struggle most. Academic programming should blend instruction in core subject areas with engaging hands-on activities that foster 21st century, higher-level thinking skills. Sessions should be enriched with art, music, and sports activities. Free breakfast and lunch should be offered (perhaps through the federal Summer Food Service Program), as well as before/after care services and transportation.

3. **Additional Time for Planning:** Summer school programs need to move from the periphery to the center of district school reform strategies. The documented value of summer learning programs for disadvantaged youth need to be clearly communicated to educators and parents throughout the school year. Planning and advertising the camp program should start early in the 2009-2010 school year and continue through the camp enrollment period. Camp teachers and curriculum coaches should have ample opportunities to plan camp sessions prior to the beginning of camp.
4. **Extensive Staff Development:** The afternoon professional development sessions should continue to provide teachers with successful, research-supported strategies that provide leverage on topics that are difficult to teach and learn. Teachers should learn new strategies, employ them with camp students, and reflect on the effectiveness with peers the next day. Many of the teachers and coaches surveyed felt this “learning in context” experience was valuable, and experts at the Center for Summer Learning agree. Team teaching models should be considered as valuable opportunities to build mentoring relationships and increase teacher quality.
5. **Strategic Partnerships:** Community partnerships should be sought and developed during the school year. Teaching resources from local universities and volunteers from the community should be investigated early in the school year. Community-based organizations with established summer programming can often leverage their existing resources to help school-based summer programs meet gaps in services.
6. **Continual Evaluation:** Measure student achievement with standardized pretest and posttest assessment tools. With input from leadership teams, camp administrators should select reading, math, writing, and/or science assessment tools that are recommended for short term, summer camp programs. Teachers should be trained on how to assess with each tool prior to the beginning of camp. All teachers, coaches, and administrators should share responsibility for effectively collecting and analyzing data.
7. **Focus on Sustainability:** Seek funding sources that will sustain the camp program if existing funding sources are insufficient or become unavailable. Local businesses and non-profit organizations, state and national grants, and

funding databases (such as the Afterschool Alliance) could provide resources that could potentially sustain, expand, and/or improve camp programs.

Appendix A: Teacher Survey Results
Title 1 Summer Camp Teacher Survey 2009

Camp Program for Students:

	Yes	No	Don't Know
Do you think the process your school used to <i>select the teachers and staff</i> for the Title 1 Extended Year Summer Camp program was effective?	91%	3%	6%
Do you think the process your school used to <i>select the students</i> for the Title 1 Extended Year Summer Camp program was effective?	84.2%	12.9%	3%
Were you able to manage and deliver the camp curriculum in 14 days?	92.1%	5.9%	2%
Did you have adequate access to the materials and technology tools you needed as you planned curriculum and delivered lessons?	88.1%	11.9%	0%
Did your students have adequate access to appropriate books for independent reading during camp?	89.9%	8.1%	2%
Did your students have adequate time for sustained independent reading during camp?	70.7%	20.2%	9.1%
Most days, was the student-teacher ratio appropriate?	93.1%	6.9%	0%

	Consistently	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Don't Know
Did the camp curriculum seem to meet the needs of the students in your camp class?	88.1%	11.9%	0%	0%	0%

	Too Long	Too Short	Just Right	Don't Know
Do you feel the length of the student day at your camp was appropriate?	2%	13.9%	84.2%	0%
Do you feel the length of the teacher day at your camp was appropriate?	15.8%	0%	83.2%	1%

Please share suggestions for increasing the number of students who attend camp (especially struggling students): <i>74 short answer responses, many provided multiple suggestions</i>	Number of Responses
Earlier advertisement or notification about camp (when other camps are advertised in early spring)	22
Offer or arrange before/after care	16
Offer or arrange transportation	16
Offer breakfast and/or lunch	11
Provide parent orientation or outreach	8
Teachers should follow-up with targeted students, urging them to come (phone calls to parents)	8
Offer camp to more grade levels (which may extend camp to siblings)	4
Use Connect Ed to inform and remind parents	3
Advertise attributes of 2009 camp program to prospective parents in 2010 (use slideshow at open house and/or parent meeting)	2
Longer program (additional weeks)	2
Teachers should promote camp to their classes as it is advertised to parents	2
Offer and advertise theme weeks	1
Provide incentives for children to come	1
Ask parents to sign attendance agreement	1

Please share suggestions to improve the student selection process: <i>47 responses; responses that were not suggestions about the student selection process were omitted</i>	Number of Responses
Notify parents earlier so more can attend	12
Include more grades, include more achievement levels, include students who struggle but aren't part of the lowest 25%	9
Exclude children with behavior problems, 3 week camp period is insufficient time to modify difficult behavior patterns	2
Group students according to need, not grade level	1
Group students according to grade level, not need	1
Establish clear guidelines regarding which students should be invited	1
Obtain an accurate list of which students will attend host school in the next school year	1
Target students who benefit from small group environment	1
Encourage more students	1
Communicate with parents	1

Which materials and/or technology tools were needed but unavailable to you or your students? <i>47 responses; some respondents gave multiple responses</i>	Number of Responses
None, NA, or I had everything I needed	21
Reliable Internet service and/or working computers	11
More time to order/purchase materials before camp began	5
Access to Renzulli Learning Systems	2
Money for cooking, math, or special project materials (I used my own money for these materials)	3
Leveled library with enough books at my campers' reading levels	2
Camp not held at home school, missing some materials	2
Master list of names and passwords for home computer assignments	1
Reading curriculum designed for short duration	1
Document camera or overhead projector	1
Technology support	1
Technology/Intelligent Classroom Tools	1
Making Words/Making Meaning Curriculum for my campers' skill level	1
Appropriate level vocabulary/phonics materials	1
Motivators	1

	1-3 Students per Teacher	4-6 Students per Teacher	7-9 Students per Teacher	10 or more Students per Teacher	Don't Know
Most days, what was the student-teacher ratio in your camp classroom?	14.9%	61.4%	16.8%	6.9%	0%

Professional Development Program for Teachers:

	Consistently Useful	Often Useful	Sometimes Useful	Rarely Useful	Never Useful
Were the strategies and practices in the professional development sessions useful to you in your instructional practice (now or in the future)?	69%	20%	9%	2%	0%

	Consistently Relevant	Often Relevant	Sometimes Relevant	Rarely Relevant	Never Relevant
Were the summer camp professional development sessions relevant to your needs?	60%	26%	11%	3%	0%

	Yes, a Lot	Yes, a Little	No, Not Really	Don't Know
Did the summer camp professional development sessions make a significant impact on your instructional practices during summer camp?	71%	20%	9%	0%

	Yes	Maybe	No	Don't Know
Do you think the summer camp professional development sessions will impact your instructional practice in the classroom this fall?	91%	7%	1%	1%

Please describe how the professional development sessions impacted your instructional practice during camp (if applicable): (75 responses, sorted into categories, general responses like "Many strategies impacted my camp instruction," were excluded)	Number of Responses
Technology integration/SMART Board training	8
Professional learning in context (learn a new strategy - practice the next day with students – reflect on practice with peers)	8
Student-centered learning/Van de Walle Student-Centered Mathematics	7
Bring Words to Life: Robust Vocabulary Instruction – Isabel Beck	6
New phonics and/or vocabulary techniques	5
Tribes Learning Community	5
Architecture of the mini-lesson/mini-lesson format	5
Conferring with readers	4
Higher-level questioning/ higher-level thinking	4
Planning time to prepare lessons for the following day	3
ESOL training/strategies	3
Reading instruction/meeting the needs of struggling readers/reading curriculum materials	3
Custom designed professional development	2
Accountable talk	2
ATLAS – Learning from student work	2
Science instruction using the 5 E's/Constructivist learning	2
Data analysis	1
Peer coaching	1
Understanding poverty	1
Video reflection	1

How might the summer camp professional development sessions impact your instructional practice this fall (if applicable)? <i>80 responses, sorted into categories, general responses like "I have many strategies to take back to my classroom" were excluded:</i>	Number of responses
Mathematics instruction (questioning, talk moves, examining student work)	16
Word work (phonics, vocabulary)	15
Technology integration (Moodle, SMART board, FCAT Explorer)	9
Reading instruction (toolkits, circles)	8
Conferring	5
Classroom library enhancement	5
Tribes Learning Community	5
Accountable talk	4
Science instruction using the 5 E's/Constructivist learning	4
Higher-level questioning/ higher-level thinking	4
Architecture of the mini-lesson/mini-lesson format	3
ATLAS – Learning from student work	2
Writing instruction (workshop strategies, conferencing)	2
Small group intervention strategies	2
Planning for the upcoming school year	2
Peer coaching	2

Appendix B:

Survey

Title 1 Summer Camp Teacher & Staff Survey 2009

1. Title 1 Extended Year Summer Camp Program Teacher & Staff Evaluation

Dear Teachers and Staff,

Thank you for participating in our first Title 1 Extended Year Summer Camp Program. Your perspectives related to this initial endeavor are very valuable to the Title 1 program. Please take a 10-20 minutes to reflect on your experience and complete this anonymous survey. Your honest responses will guide coordinators as they evaluate the program and craft improvements for next year.

2.

The questions in this section of the survey ask about your experiences with the planning, organization, and operation of the 2009 Title 1 Extended Year Summer Camp program for students.

1. Do you think the process your school used to select the teachers and staff for the Title 1 Extended Year Summer Camp program was effective?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

2. Please share suggestions to improve the teacher/staff selection process.

3. Do you think the process your school used to select the students for the Title 1 Extended Year Summer Camp program was effective?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

4. Please share suggestions to improve the student selection process.

5. Please share suggestions for increasing the number of students who attend camp (especially struggling students).

Title 1 Summer Camp Teacher & Staff Survey 2009

6. Did the camp curriculum seem to meet the needs of the students in your camp class?

- Consistently
- Sometimes
- Rarely
- Never
- Don't Know

7. Were you able to manage and deliver the camp curriculum in 14 days?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

8. Did you have adequate access to the materials and technology tools you needed as you planned curriculum and delivered lessons?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

9. Which materials and/or technology tools were needed but unavailable to you or your students?

10. Did your students have adequate access to appropriate books for independent reading during camp?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

11. Did your students have adequate time for sustained independent reading during camp?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

Title 1 Summer Camp Teacher & Staff Survey 2009

12. Most days, what was the student-teacher ratio in your camp classroom?

- 1-3 students per teacher
- 4-6 students per teacher
- 7-9 students per teacher
- 10 or more students per teacher
- Don't Know

13. Most days, was the student-teacher ratio appropriate?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

14. Please share your thoughts about the effect of the student-teacher ratio on the quality of the educational experience for the children in your camp classroom.

15. Do you feel the length of the student day at your camp was appropriate?

- Too Long
- Too Short
- Just Right
- Don't Know

16. Do you feel the length of the teacher day at your camp was appropriate?

- Too Long
- Too Short
- Just Right
- Don't Know

3.

The questions in this section of the survey ask about your experiences with the professional development portion (afternoon sessions) of your camp experience.

Title 1 Summer Camp Teacher & Staff Survey 2009

1. Were the strategies and practices presented in the professional development sessions useful to you in your instructional practice (now or in the future)?

- Consistently useful
- Often useful
- Sometimes useful
- Rarely useful
- Never useful

2. Were the summer camp professional development sessions relevant to your needs?

- Consistently relevant
- Often relevant
- Sometimes relevant
- Rarely relevant
- Never relevant

3. Did the summer camp professional development sessions make a significant impact on your instructional practices during summer camp?

- Yes, a lot
- Yes, a little
- No, not really
- Don't know

4. Please describe how the professional development sessions impacted your instructional practice during camp (if applicable).

5. Do you think the summer camp professional development sessions will impact your instructional practice in the classroom this fall?

- Yes
- Maybe
- No
- Don't Know

Title 1 Summer Camp Teacher & Staff Survey 2009

6. How might the summer camp professional development sessions impact your instructional practice this fall (if applicable)?

7. Which professional development sessions were most useful to you?

8. Please indicate some of your ongoing professional development needs (select all that apply):

- Peer Coaching
- Conferring
- Architecture of the Mini-lesson
- Read Aloud with Accountable Talk
- Higher Level Questioning
- Action Research
- Integration of Technology into Curriculum
- Other (please specify)

9. Please share any additional reflections and/or suggestions regarding any aspect of the summer camp program.

This is the end of the survey. Thank you for your time. Best wishes for a relaxing and enjoyable summer.

Title 1 Summer Camp Curriculum Coach Survey 2009

1. Title 1 Extended Year Summer Camp Program Evaluation- Curriculum Coach

Dear Curriculum Coach,
Thank you for participating in our first Title 1 Extended Year Summer Camp Program. Your perspectives related to this initial endeavor are very valuable to the Title 1 program. Please take a few minutes to reflect on your experience and complete this anonymous survey. Your honest responses will guide coordinators as they evaluate the program and craft improvements for next year.

2.

The questions below ask about your experiences with the planning, organization, and operation of the 2009 Title 1 Extended Year Summer Camp program for students.

1. Briefly describe the process your school used to select the teachers and staff for the Title 1 Extended Year Summer Camp.

2. Briefly describe the process your school used to select the students for the Title 1 Extended Year Summer Camp program.

3. Briefly describe the curriculum and the process used by your school to develop or select the curriculum for the Title 1 Extended Year Summer Camp program.

4. Please share suggestions to improve the curriculum development/selection process.

5. Please share suggestions for making the camp curriculum easier to manage and deliver in 14 days.

6. Please list some key goals you had for your camp students.

Title 1 Summer Camp Curriculum Coach Survey 2009

7. Do you think the curriculum, as designed and delivered, helped you meet the goals you set for your camp students?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

8. What observations and/or data suggest that the camp curriculum was or was not effective?

9. Do you recommend changing the goals and/or curriculum of the summer camp program at your school? If so, what changes do you recommend?

10. Please share your thoughts about the effect of the student-teacher ratio on the quality of the educational experience for the children in your camp classrooms.

11. Please share any additional reflections and/or suggestions regarding any aspect of the summer camp program.

Thank you very much for completing this survey. Best wishes for a relaxing and enjoyable summer.

References

- National Center for Summer Learning (2009). *What Makes a Summer Learning Program Effective? Reading Rockets* [Web site]. Retrieved on 8/5/09 from http://www.summerlearning.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=98&Itemid=420
- Center for Summer Learning at Johns Hopkins University (2009). *It's a Fact...*[Web site, Home Page text box]. Retrieved on 8/15/09 from <http://www.summerlearning.org/>
- Education Commission of the States (2009). *Summer Learning - Moving from the Periphery to the Core*. The Progress of Education Reform 10 (3). Retrieved on 8/5/09 from http://www.summerlearning.org/media/researchandpublications/2009/EC_SMovingfromPeripheryBrief.June2009.pdf