

1968

## A Survey of Small School Districts' Junior High School Summer Program Offerings

Donald W. Moore  
*Central Washington University*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/etd>



Part of the [Educational Assessment, Evaluation, and Research Commons](#), and the [Educational Methods Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Moore, Donald W., "A Survey of Small School Districts' Junior High School Summer Program Offerings" (1968). *All Master's Theses*. 920.  
<https://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/etd/920>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Master's Theses at ScholarWorks@CWU. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@CWU. For more information, please contact [scholarworks@cwu.edu](mailto:scholarworks@cwu.edu).

198

A SURVEY OF SMALL SCHOOL DISTRICTS'  
JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL SUMMER PROGRAM OFFERINGS

.....  
.....



A Thesis  
Presented to  
the Graduate Faculty  
Central Washington State College



In Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Degree  
Master of Education



by  
Donald W. Moore  
August 1968

LD

5771.3

M 8195

SPECIAL  
COLLECTION

[REDACTED]  
A [REDACTED]

170840

APPROVED FOR THE GRADUATE FACULTY

---

William G. Gaskell, COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN

---

Darwin J. Goodey

---

Roy F. Ruebel

### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express sincere gratitude to Dr. William Gaskell for his assistance and encouragement throughout the study, and Dr. Roy Ruebel and Mr. Darwin Goodey for serving on the thesis committee.

Special acknowledgment is made to my wife, Diana, for her patience and constant encouragement.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. THE PROBLEM AND DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED. . . .	1
The Problem. . . . .	1
Statement of the problem . . . . .	1
Importance of the study. . . . .	1
Limitations of the study . . . . .	2
Definitions of Terms Used. . . . .	3
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE . . . . .	4
Literature on the Development of Summer	
School Programs. . . . .	4
Literature on the Establishment of Summer	
School Programs. . . . .	5
Literature on the Evaluation of Summer	
School Programs. . . . .	7
Literature on Studies of Summer Programs . . .	10
Conclusion . . . . .	13
III. AN ANALYSIS OF DATA. . . . .	14
Introduction . . . . .	14
Financing Summer School Programs . . . . .	14
Tuition. . . . .	14
Federal aid. . . . .	15
Local school funds . . . . .	15

CHAPTER	PAGE
Enrollment . . . . .	15
Summer School Transportation . . . . .	16
Teaching Staff . . . . .	16
Salary . . . . .	18
Procurement of teachers. . . . .	18
Source of Students . . . . .	18
Class Size . . . . .	19
Innovative Summer School Programs. . . . .	19
Stevenson School District. . . . .	19
Carson School District . . . . .	19
Chehalis School District . . . . .	20
University Place School District . . . . .	20
Summer hike program . . . . .	20
Nature study program . . . . .	20
IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS. . . . .	21
Conclusions. . . . .	21
Recommendations. . . . .	22
Suggestions for Further Study. . . . .	23
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	24
APPENDICES . . . . .	25

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
I. Junior High Enrollment in Basic	
Subject Areas. . . . .	17
II. Distribution of Enrollment . . . . .	17

## CHAPTER I

### THE PROBLEM AND DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED

Each summer thousands of youngsters are enrolled in summer school classes throughout the country. Many students attend summer school to gain skill in reading, mathematics, or in some other subject in which they are weak, while many others attend summer school to take advantage of subjects which their normal schedules would not allow, such as driver education and typing. To some students, summer study is a time when education-experiences can be enriched and intellectual appetite can be stimulated (6:144).

#### I. THE PROBLEM

Statement of the Problem. It was the purpose of this study to obtain details of summer school programs, including practices which were considered by the districts to be innovative.

Importance of the study. Summer school programs offer students opportunities that would often otherwise be unavailable. Such opportunities include remedial training, subject enrichment, and study tours. Many school districts provide summer programs which offer these opportunities while other districts do not. From this study, small school

districts will be able to compare their programs to those of other small school districts. This study also reviewed innovations and practices in use in some districts which may be useful in other districts.

Limitations of the study. This study was limited by five factors:

1. The study was restricted to the State of Washington.
2. The study surveyed only second and third class districts; that is, districts having fewer than 2,000 students.
3. The study reviewed summer programs in effect during the summer of 1968.
4. The study was limited to grades seven, eight and nine.
5. The information received for this study was taken largely from a questionnaire.

W. W. Charters (3:133-34) lists five limitations in the use of questionnaires:

1. The written questionnaire may be intrinsically difficult to fill out.
2. The questions may not be clearly understood by the one who answers.
3. The same misunderstanding may occur when the sender interprets the answer: He may give the terms a content which the writer did not intend.
4. The sampling may be poor.
5. Questionnaires are often answered by people who do not give the exact facts. This may

be due to haste or to lack of knowledge.

## II. DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED

Acceleration course. A course which is offered to high ability students so that they will have the opportunity to take more course work in the subject area than would normally be possible during the regular school year.

Enrichment course. A course which enriches previous learning by the use of field trips, laboratory experiences, or work experiences.

Remedial course. A course designed to bring the learner who has a gap in his developmental learning up to the level of his classmates. Mathematics and language skills are often taught remedially.

Summer school program. An organized program whereby a school district maintains one or more courses or activities during a four-to-eight week summer session. Such courses or activities include academic subjects, recreation or enrichment programs.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Much has been written about the role summer school programs play in American education. Numerous articles relate how summer school programs have developed, how programs should be administered and financed, and how programs should be evaluated. There have also been pilot studies made which examine innovations in course offerings and indicate trends for the future.

#### I. LITERATURE ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF SUMMER SCHOOL PROGRAMS

In a National Education Association survey made in 1966 (6:10), it was reported that 18,000 secondary schools offered summer school programs in which over 5,000,000 students were enrolled. While sixty-seven per cent of these schools offered remedial courses, only three per cent offered remedial courses only. From this survey, Benjamin Pearse stated that the main thrust of summer school programs is "toward expanding the student's horizon, enriching his educational experience, and stimulating his intellectual appetite" (6:11). Pearse added that the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 deserves some credit for the increase in summer school enrollment (6:12).

Holmes and Seawell (4:10-12) contended that summer school program development has been slow for two reasons:

1. Experimental and traditional summer school programs have been based primarily on economic efficiency and not on educational effectiveness.
2. Experimental and traditional summer school programs in the main have been based on traditional curriculum requirements and decisions, and not on the need of individual children and youth for quality education.

Superintendent of Public Instruction for the State of Washington, Louis Bruno (2:1), reported that the number of school districts offering summer school programs in Washington State has grown from fifty-nine districts in 1963 to 125 districts in 1966. He indicated that the rapid growth is closely related to the availability of federal funds in Project Head Start, and Title I of Public Law 89-10. Bruno also stated that "This increase in the number of districts and the number of children involved in summer school may indicate a trend toward year-around education, with classes during the summer on a voluntary basis."

## II. LITERATURE ON THE ESTABLISHMENT OF SUMMER SCHOOL PROGRAMS

Holmes and Seawell (4:10-12) provided five guidelines for establishing an effective summer school program:

1. Enrollment must be voluntary.
2. Financing would be on the same basis as the regular year. Most local schools depend on tuition payments instead of local taxes.
3. Summer schools should be a school-board-and-central-administration responsibility instead of fragmentary.
4. Summer schools must be designed to meet the needs of all children--not just those who need remedial aid or who warrant accelerated training.
5. More emphasis should be placed on subjects best taught during summer.

A National Education Association study in 1966 (8:20-22) pertaining to the length of summer school sessions showed that three per cent of secondary schools surveyed maintained a summer session of less than six weeks; that fifty-two per cent of these secondary schools maintained a six-week session, and that forty-five per cent of these schools maintained sessions longer than six weeks. The same National Education Association survey showed that seventy-four per cent of the secondary schools charged tuition. The survey report concluded by stating that "The summer school session does offer a variety of work designed to meet the specific needs, including remedial, enrichment, avocational and recreational interests of students."

Brown, Klahn, and Romano (1:15-16) stated that "The summer school program should not be tied down to the earning

of credit or to the extension of the subject matter offered during the school year. They listed four purposes which the summer school program should fulfill:

1. Summer schools should provide activities which enrich the academic program of the school year.
2. Summer schools should provide courses in culture.
3. Summer schools should offer experiences in activities not offered during the regular school year.
4. Summer school should provide a testing ground for new teaching techniques.

An editorial in Good Housekeeping (7:180) indicated that the summer school should provide a genuine change from the regular school year. Such courses as typing and driver education should be offered. The editorial pointed out that the National Science Foundation sponsored 125 summer science-training projects for high ability students in such subjects as geology, biology, and mathematics. Other programs gave some students the opportunity to attend summer classes on a college campus.

### III. LITERATURE ON THE EVALUATION OF SUMMER SCHOOL PROGRAMS

Brown, Klahn, and Romano (1:15-16) provided a list of eighteen questions which the summer school administrator

should answer about his own summer school program:

1. Does the summer school program provide offerings at all grade levels?
2. Does the summer program provide a remedial program of basic skills?
3. Does the summer program provide extension or enrichment courses for the basic subject areas?
4. Does the summer school offer activities not offered during the regular school year?
5. Does the summer program offer courses in culture such as art, music, drama and physical education?
6. Do the remedial courses have less than twenty pupils in a class?
7. Is the summer school session at least six weeks long?
8. Is the approach to activities different than during the regular year?
9. Does the summer program provide for experimentation?
10. Is evaluation of the summer program continuous?
11. Are teachers' salaries comparable to those during the regular school year?
12. Is there sufficient secretarial and clerical help during the summer session?
13. Is the summer school administration aware of summer school philosophies, purposes?
14. Is there a school nurse on duty during the summer session?
15. Are the parents and students made sufficiently aware of summer school offerings?

16. Is enrollment voluntary?
17. Are the summer school personnel qualified to function well?
18. Are there activities for all students?

Woods (10:38) asserted that "It is difficult to gather reliable and valid evidence to convince the skeptical public of the value of summer school. There is a need for evidence that will enable educators to determine if attendance in summer school contributes significantly to the attainment of accepted objectives." Woods (10:39-40) further pointed out that there are two advantages of summer school:

1. Students usually enroll for one or two courses only.
2. There is a more relaxed atmosphere during summer school.

Woods (10:41-42) stated that the six main evaluative criteria for summer school programs should be as follows:

1. Objectives of the summer school program.
2. Organization and administration.
3. Qualifications of the summer school staff.
4. The scope and the quality of the curriculum.
5. The quality of the instruction.
6. The pupils' attainment of objectives

#### IV. LITERATURE ON STUDIES OF SUMMER PROGRAMS

In 1965 an extensive program was set up at South High School in Bakersfield, California (5:464-468). It was financed by NDEA Title V and by the Ford Foundation. The objectives for that program were as follows:

1. The number of electives would be extended.
2. There would be flexible scheduling.
3. There would be in-service education for teachers.
4. There would be full use of school facilities.
5. Creativity and experimentation would be encouraged.
6. There would be experimentation in combination of curriculum, time and class structure.
7. Only willing faculty would be involved.
8. The program would develop readiness for team teaching and flexible scheduling for the fall.
9. Auxiliary services and counselling services would be maintained.
10. The counselor's role would be expanded during the summer session.

From that summer school session, it was found that the following points should be considered for future programs:

1. There must be more financial support.

2. There must be a planning break between spring and summer.
3. There must be more qualified personnel.
4. There is a need for different time structures.
5. The summer school program should be coordinated with the Neighborhood Youth Corps so that more disadvantaged youth can be incorporated into the program.
6. There must be more experimentation with auxiliary services.
7. There must be continued counselor involvement.

From a pilot study in Texas, Woods (10:43-44) found the following relationships based on a sampling of 350 students:

1. There was a negative relationship between grades earned during the preceding school year and measured attitude toward summer school.
2. There was no relationship between socio-economic status (based on father's occupation) and attitude of the student.
3. There was no significant relationship between parents' attitudes toward children at summer school and the children's attitude at summer school.
4. There was no significant relationship between expressed interest toward regular school and measured attitude toward summer school.

From a 1961 study of Texas summer schools, Woods (9:46-47) found the following to be true:

1. Summer school programs were rarely offered in schools with less than 400 regular term students.
2. One out of four regular term students attended summer school in schools of 1,000 or more, while one out of eight regular term students attended summer school in schools of 400 or less regular term enrollment.
3. The tuition for summer school classes was nearly always thirty dollars per Carnegie unit.
4. Teachers were paid less for teaching summer school. They were usually paid a flat rate.
5. The modal length for a summer session was eight weeks.
6. A typical day consisted of two two-hour classes.
7. The emphasis seemed to be pointed toward enrichment, acceleration and recreation.
8. Summer schools were here to stay.

From this study, Woods (9:52) concluded that summer school should be free for the following reasons:

1. Tuition makes summer school a school for the privileged.
2. Summer school tuition discriminates against the underprivileged.
3. Free tuition will enable more students to finish their education more quickly, thus saving the school district money.
4. Students can make up courses easier in the summer than they can during the regular school year.

Woods (1:52) added that facilities would be in use throughout

the year instead of only during the regular school term. He also stated that effective air-conditioning was mandatory in Southern summer schools.

#### V. CONCLUSION

The literature written about the development, establishment and evaluation of summer school programs can be summarized in the following two quotations by Woods (10:45) and Umstatted (9:53), respectively:

Summer school programs appear to be an excellent means of expanding educational opportunity for the nation's youth. The task of public school educators is to provide the best possible summer school programs for all the youth of the community with the limited resources that are available. This necessitates evaluation, and, since procedures for evaluating summer schools are not highly developed, it is imperative that a continued effort be made to develop improved instruments and procedures.

Each program should be patterned to the needs of the pupils and the community through continued experimentation, evaluation, and creative effort.

## CHAPTER III

### AN ANALYSIS OF DATA

#### I. INTRODUCTION

On June 25, 1968 a questionnaire (Appendix, page 25) was sent to all second and third class school districts in the State of Washington which had reported summer programs in 1966. The purpose of the questionnaire was to obtain details of offerings for seventh, eighth and ninth-grade students. Of the seventy-two districts surveyed, five districts replied that they had become first-class districts, forty-nine districts reported that they held no summer school program for junior high students, and eighteen districts affirmed that junior high classes were offered in their systems.

#### II. FINANCING SUMMER SCHOOL PROGRAMS

The summer school programs maintained by the eighteen districts were financed by tuition, federal aid or local school funds.

Tuition. Seven school districts relied on tuition as an economic base for their programs. Five of these districts' summer programs were wholly supported by tuition. In the remaining two districts, tuition supplied only twenty-five

per cent and one per cent of the funds, respectively.

Tuitions ranged from ten to forty-five dollars. Three districts charged ten dollars for a course, two other districts charged twelve and thirty dollars, respectively. One district with a summer enrollment of 170 junior high students charged from ten to forty-five dollars tuition, depending upon the number of classes or type of class taken.

Federal aid. Eleven summer programs offered in 1968 were financed wholly or in part by federal funds. Nine summer programs were wholly supported by federal funds. Federal funds made up ten per cent of one district's base.

Local school funds. Four districts reported using local school funds to support their summer programs. One of these districts based its entire program on local funds, while others used local funds as a supplementary base.

### III. ENROLLMENT

The junior high enrollment for second and third class school districts in 1968 totalled over 560. Included in this figure were 247 seventh-graders, 159 eighth-graders, and 155 ninth-graders. Table I indicates that there were students enrolled in most of the basic subject areas. The results from the questionnaire indicated that federally-sponsored remedial programs in reading and mathematics

accounted for many of the students enrolled in those areas. The results from the questionnaire also indicated that instrumental music and recreation were the only programs offered in several districts.

Table II points out that the majority of the enrollment was concentrated in five of the seventeen districts with junior high programs. Only two districts maintained summer programs with more than 100 junior high students.

#### IV. SUMMER SCHOOL TRANSPORTATION

Of the eighteen school districts offering junior high summer programs, only two districts provided bus transportation to and from school. Federal funds paid the cost for one of these districts, while local school funds paid for the transportation in the other district. One district, which offers several field trips and hikes, paid the transportation cost for these outings with school funds.

#### V. TEACHING STAFF

The summer school teaching staff for seventh, eighth and ninth grades consisted of fifty certified teachers and four student teachers. Ten districts employed but one summer school teacher teaching junior high students. Six districts employed between two and ten teachers, and one district employed eleven junior high summer school teachers.

TABLE I  
JUNIOR HIGH ENROLLMENT IN BASIC SUBJECT AREAS

Subject Areas	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 9
English-Language Arts	7	4	5
Mathematics	71	6	4
Science	2	0	0
Social Science	2	6	0
Reading	117	52	15
Art	5	4	15
Typing	8	7	21
Industrial Arts	0	0	0
Foreign Languages	0	0	0
Health-P.E.	1	1	3
Home Economics	2	2	6
Instrumental Music	48	35	33
Vocal Music	8	7	6
Recreation	35	35	47

TABLE II  
DISTRIBUTION OF ENROLLMENT

Number of Students	Number of Districts
0 - 10	8
11 - 20	1
21 - 30	1
31 - 40	1
41 - 50	1
51 - 60	2
61 - 70	0
71 - 80	0
81 - 90	0
91 - 100	0
Over 100	2

One district used three student teachers.

Salary. In four districts the teachers' salaries were based on salaries earned during the regular teaching year. One district paid its teachers at a rate which was based on four-fifths of their normal school year salary. The remaining districts paid their teachers according to the following schedule:

<u>Per Hour</u>	<u>Number of Districts</u>
\$2.00	1
5.00	9
6.00	2

This schedule indicates that five dollars per hour was the most common amount paid by most school districts.

Procurement of Teachers. Sixteen districts reported that all of their teachers were members of the district's regular term staff. One district indicated that ninety per cent of its teachers came from its regular staff.

## VI. SOURCE OF STUDENTS

Sixteen districts reported that all of their summer school students came from within the district. One district reported that ninety per cent of its summer students came from within the district, and one district reported that ninety-five per cent of its students came from within the district.

## VII. CLASS SIZE

Six districts reported that there was no set minimum number of students needed in order to maintain a class. Eight districts set the minimum between eight and eighteen students. One district, which held an instrumental music class, reported that a minimum of fifty students was needed in order to hold this class. This class was open for students in fourth through ninth grades.

## VIII. INNOVATIVE SUMMER SCHOOL PROGRAMS

Four districts in the State of Washington featured innovative programs, which included junior high students. These programs have taken advantage of students' needs and interests.

Stevenson School District. Stevenson School District, east of Vancouver, Washington offered an innovative recreation program. In this program, students of all ages cooperated on various projects. Such projects included building a log cabin and filming a national award-winning film.

Carson School District. Carson School District, near Stevenson, operated a summer program which had been offered each summer since 1962. In this program, students could participate in several different sports activities or in

arts and crafts classes.

Chehalis School District. Chehalis School District offered a summer reading improvement program which involved 250 students in grades one through twelve. Of this total, forty-five were junior high age students. The application for enrollment (Appendix, page 28) describes the goals of the program. An evaluation of the student's progress (Appendix, page 29) was sent home at the end of the session.

University Place School District. University Place School District, near Tacoma, offered credit and non-credit courses for all ages. The whole program was financed by tuition. The most unusual aspects of this program were the recreational and nature study programs.

Summer hike program. For the first time, two hiking trips were offered. Information sheets describing the hikes were sent home to the parents. The wilderness hike was open to anyone between the ages of fourteen and eighteen, and was so popular that it was offered twice. The Olympic Coast hike was open to students from eleven to fifteen years of age.

Nature study program. The nature study program was offered to fourth through ninth grade students. Twenty-five dollars tuition was charged. Parents and students were given a detailed plan for this course.

## CHAPTER IV

### CONCLUSIONS AND GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS

There are several conclusions and general recommendations which can be made from this study of junior high summer offerings in second and third class districts in Washington State.

#### I. CONCLUSIONS

1. Many second and third class districts offer no summer school program for students in the seventh, eighth, or ninth grades.

2. Few districts offered innovative summer programs.

3. Innovative programs appeared to be successful in districts which offered them.

4. Federal funds played an important role in the financing of summer programs in several districts. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Title I and III, providing the funds for equipment and paying program costs; and the Public Law 89-10, providing funds for several remedial and recreational programs for the disadvantaged, were the sources for much of the federal aid given.

5. Recreational projects, such as hikes and building programs, seemed to be very popular with all ages including junior high students. Such activities seemed to appeal to

the students' interests and were largely carried on outdoors.

6. Few second and third class districts provided bus transportation to and from summer school. Only two districts provided such transportation.

7. Several districts in the study offered only remedial courses, such as reading and mathematics.

8. Few students and teachers came from outside the district.

9. Several school districts offered activities which brought elementary and secondary students together. Such activities appeared to be successful.

## II. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. More advantage should be taken of federal funds which are available to districts in financial need or to districts having students in financial need.

2. School districts should strive to develop recreational projects involving a large number of students of varying ages.

3. School districts should determine whether or not the lack of bus transportation is a limiting factor to the success of the summer program.

4. Consideration should be given to combining two or more districts' summer programs to form a larger summer

program with more offerings. Teachers from the districts could then cooperate in the planning of the curriculum and share ideas and philosophies.

5. More use should be made of public relations media. Only three districts surveyed used pamphlets to describe their offerings. Attractive brochures would perhaps tend to stimulate more interest in summer programs.

### III. SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

There are a number of potential related studies which would further establish the role and needs of the summer education programs in Washington State at the junior high level.

1. A study of first class districts' summer offerings at the junior high level.

2. A detailed study of the development and offerings of a single summer school program in a first, second or third class district.

3. A study of the use of teachers' aides and student teachers in the summer program.

4. A study of the role of summer school transportation in first, second and third class districts.

5. A study of remedial summer course offerings at the junior high level in the State of Washington.

6. A study of districts where summer education programs have failed.

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Brown, Douglas, Rich Klahn, and Louis Romano. "Four Dimensions for Summer School," American School Board Journal, 151:15-16, August, 1965.
2. Bruno, Louis. Summer School Survey. Olympia: Washington State Printing Office, 1966.
3. Charters, W. W. Curriculum Construction. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1923.
4. Holmes, George W. and William Seawell. "Summer School Reappraised," American School Board Journal, 155:10-12, January, 1968.
5. Moroski, Henry J. and Cecil Briscoe. "Summer School: A Total Experience in Learning," Clearing House, 40:464-68, April, 1966.
6. Pearse, Benjamin H. "New Trends in the Schools," American Education, 2:10-12, October, 1966.
7. \_\_\_\_\_, "Summer School: It Can Benefit Most Students," Good Housekeeping, 162:180, June, 1966.
8. \_\_\_\_\_, "Summer School Programs for Students," NEA Research Bulletin, 45:20-22, March, 1967.
9. Umstattd, J. G. "Summer Programs and Secondary Schools," NASSP Journal, 50:46-54, March, 1966.
10. Wood, Bob G. "Evaluating Summer School Programs," NASSP Journal, 50:38-45, March, 1966.

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE

APPENDIX A  
QUESTIONNAIRE

Please answer each of the following questions regarding your district's junior high summer school offerings.

1. Are you maintaining a summer school program this year? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_
2. How is the summer school program in your district financed? Please indicate per cent of total cost coming from each source:
  - A. Tuition and fees \_\_\_\_\_
  - B. Federal aid programs \_\_\_\_\_
  - C. Local school funds \_\_\_\_\_
  - D. Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_
3. Please indicate your schedule of tuition and fees.
4. Do you provide bus transportation to and from summer school? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_
5. How is bus transportation financed?
6. For the following subject areas, please list the junior high enrollment for grades 7, 8, 9;

	(7) _____	(8) _____	(9) _____
English-Language Arts	_____	_____	_____
Mathematics	_____	_____	_____
Science	_____	_____	_____
Social Science	_____	_____	_____
Reading	_____	_____	_____
Art	_____	_____	_____
Typing	_____	_____	_____
Industrial Arts	_____	_____	_____
Foreign Languages	_____	_____	_____
Health-P.E.	_____	_____	_____
Home Economics	_____	_____	_____
Instrumental Music	_____	_____	_____
Vocal Music	_____	_____	_____
Title I - PL 89-10	_____	_____	_____
Recreation	_____	_____	_____
Total Enrollments	_____	_____	_____

7. What is your total junior high summer school teaching staff?\_\_\_\_\_
8. What amount are summer school teachers paid? \_\_\_\_\_ Is this based on an hourly rate or on some other basis? Please specify.
9. Please indicate the source for these teachers.
10. Do all of your junior high summer school students live in your district? Yes\_\_\_\_\_ No\_\_\_\_\_
11. What per cent of your students come from outside your district to attend summer school? \_\_\_\_\_
12. How many students must there be in order for a class to be held?\_\_\_\_\_
13. Please describe or include literature on any innovative or demonstration type summer program not offered during the school year. Please use back of this sheet if further space is needed.
14. I would appreciate any other information about your program such as enrollment, growth of enrollment and any other significant information regarding the program.
15. Please enclose copies of brochures or other literature pertaining to your summer school program.

APPENDIX B

APPLICATION AND EVALUATION FORMS FOR  
CHEHALIS SCHOOL DISTRICT  
SUMMER READING IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

CHEHALIS SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 302

Chehalis, Washington  
May 4, 1968

TO: Parents  
FROM: Chester V. Rhodes, Superintendent

Classes in reading improvement will be offered this summer to all children within the Chehalis School District who will be enrolled in grades two through twelve next year. (Students now in grades one through eleven.) Instruction will stress vocabulary development, comprehension skills, and accelerated reading.

Classes will be held daily for about two hours beginning June 12 and ending July 14, a period of five weeks. NO TUITION will be charged since the Chehalis Public Schools will sponsor this program under Title I of the Federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

If you are interested in registering your child, please complete the application for enrollment below and have your child return it to his teacher no later than Thursday, May 11. Because most youngsters are involved in a variety of activities during the summer, a choice of sessions is provided. Parents will receive notification of the time and place of classes later in the month after enrollments have been tabulated.

-----  
APPLICATION FOR ENROLLMENT IN

SUMMER READING IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

Student's Name \_\_\_\_\_ Grade \_\_\_\_\_  
Parent's Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Next \_\_\_\_\_  
Address \_\_\_\_\_ Year \_\_\_\_\_  
Telephone Number \_\_\_\_\_ School \_\_\_\_\_  
Class preference: \_\_\_\_\_ or \_\_\_\_\_  
Morning Afternoon

# CHEHALIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS

SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 302

CHESTER V. RHODES, SUPERINTENDENT

CHEHALIS, WASHINGTON

29

July 14, 1968

Dear Parents:

With the conclusion of the Summer Reading Program, all of us involved in its operation are confident that you have observed a marked improvement in your child's reading ability. It was our intent that each child's individual needs be served so that his participation would be beneficial for years to come.

We appreciate your interest and enthusiastic support. It is our hope that it will be possible to obtain federal funds again next year with which to finance another program.

Sincerely,

Chester V. Rhodes  
Superintendent of Schools

PROGRESS REPORT FOR \_\_\_\_\_

Your child has shown improvement in the following reading skills:

Your child should work on the following skills to develop into a stronger reader;

Please note:

The signature has been redacted due to security reasons

\_\_\_\_\_  
Summer Reading Teacher