


1969

A Survey of the Opinions of Parents and Teachers Regarding the Reporting System Used in the Vale Elementary School in Cashmere, Washington

David LeRoy Lentz
Central Washington University

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

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

Recommended Citation

Lentz, David LeRoy, "A Survey of the Opinions of Parents and Teachers Regarding the Reporting System Used in the Vale Elementary School in Cashmere, Washington" (1969). *All Master's Theses*. 1119.
<https://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/etd/1119>

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.

A SURVEY OF THE OPINIONS OF PARENTS AND TEACHERS REGARDING
THE REPORTING SYSTEM USED IN THE VALE ELEMENTARY
SCHOOL IN CASHMERE, WASHINGTON

A Thesis
Presented to
the Graduate Faculty
Central Washington State College

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

by
David LeRoy Lentz
August, 1969

LD
5771.31
L45

SPECIAL
COLLECTION

174559

Library
Central Washington
State College
Ellensburg, Washington

APPROVED FOR THE GRADUATE FACULTY

William G. Gaskell, COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN

John E. Davis

Dan A. Unruh

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The writer wishes to express appreciation to his committee, Dr. William Gaskell, Chairman; Dr. Dan Unruh; and Dr. John Davis for giving of their time, suggestions, and criticisms.

Also, a special thank you to the faculty of the Vale Elementary School in Cashmere, Washington, for their assistance in this study.

Finally, to my wife, Kathy, who served as critic and proofreader, goes my deepest gratitude and appreciation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION	1
The Problem	4
Scope of the Study	5
Definition of Terms Used	5
Ability	5
Achievement	5
Conference	5
Dual marking system	6
Effort symbols	6
Grades or marks	6
Rating system or checklist	6
Report card	6
Traditional reporting system	6
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	7
Rationale for Report Cards	7
Types of Written Reports	9
Trends in Reporting	11
Faults of the Traditional System	14
Setting up a New Reporting System	25
Summary	29
III. PROCEDURE	31

CHAPTER	PAGE
IV. ANALYSIS OF DATA	35
Statement Number One	38
Statement Number Two	38
Statement Number Three	38
Statement Number Four	39
Statement Number Five	40
Statement Number Six	40
Statement Number Seven	41
Statement Number Eight	42
Statement Number Nine	43
Statement Number Ten	44
Statement Number Eleven	44
Statement Number Twelve	45
Statement Number Thirteen	46
Statement Number Fourteen	47
Statement Number Fifteen	47
Statement Number Sixteen	48
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	49
Summary	49
Conclusions	50
Recommendations	51
BIBLIOGRAPHY	54

CHAPTER	PAGE
APPENDIX A. Parents' Questionnaire	61
APPENDIX B. Teachers' Questionnaire	63
APPENDIX C. Letter to Parents	65
APPENDIX D. Report of Pupil's Progress--Grades 1, 2, and 3	66
APPENDIX E. Report of Pupils' Progress--Grades 4 and 5 .	67
APPENDIX F. Number of Parents' Responses on Each Statement: Five Choices	68
APPENDIX G. Number of Teachers' Responses on Each Statement: Five Choices	69
APPENDIX H. Number of Parents' Responses on Each Statement: Three Choices	70
APPENDIX I. Number of Teachers' Responses on Each Statement: Three Choices	71
APPENDIX J. Comparison in Percentages of Parents' and Teachers' Responses on Each Statement: Three Choices	72

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
I. Percentage of Parents' Responses on Each Statement: Three Choices	36
II. Percentage of Teachers' Responses on Each Statement: Three Choices	37

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The traditional reporting system was described by Hockstad as a system that tells how a child rates in achievement with reference to grade level standards. She explained that this rating may be expressed in percentage form or in letter grade form with the latter method being more common in recent years (26:174). The traditional card was developed for the American way of life that existed years ago. At that time, most schools were small, schools were community centers, and parents, teachers, and schools knew and understood each other (5:2). In recent years, the educational scene has changed tremendously (12:5-19; 20:245; 22:33-7; and 50:498), and with this change, a dissatisfaction with the traditional reporting system arose, especially among educators. In October, 1967, the Washington Elementary School Principles Association adopted a resolution which brought the attention of many Washington educators to the problems of the traditional reporting system. One part of the resolution stated:

. . . little in the way of research and nothing in the standardly expoused philosophy of public school education can be construed to support such an educationally unsound system of reporting pupil progress, a system that finds its only support in the system itself and the establishment that has built up around it . . . (52:12).

John Munden, a past president of the above mentioned organization, added:

. . . our society still imposes a system of testing and grading that is a throwback to the tradition and ignorance of the late Renaissance. . . . Yet we continue to pigeonhole children arbitrarily with an outmoded, outdated system of grading that is grossly out of tune with the needs of children and society (40:11).

Many classroom teachers agreed with the statements made above by the elementary principals (47:29; 17:20). In fact, many classroom teachers have expressed their distaste for writing reports and making records. Rothney found that this task is often regarded as extra clerical work to be done at certain times (47:29). Other teachers have commented that putting marks on report cards is their most unpleasant task. They disliked marking a child against the class average which was an external standard rather than against a child's own standard (17:20).

However, a number of researchers have noted differences in opinion that exist between parents and teachers towards reporting. For example, in most instances, Yauch found that the teachers were the major force in changing a marking system (54:50). Richardson pointed out that teachers recognize the discouraging effects of poor marks on students but parents have confidence that grades in school indicate present effort and future success (45:9). Rothney concluded that parents are familiar with the old-fashioned (traditional) report card and, are thus most comfortable with the traditional report card (47:30). He added that parents do tend to

distrust anything that seems less definite than a letter grade or numerical mark (47:30). Kingston and Wash maintained that parents were contented with the traditional cards and letter grades and even desired them (29:36-7). Another researcher found that parents wanted to keep the report card with a five-point scale even though this type of report card did not tell the parents the things they wanted to know as indicated by their responses on a questionnaire (5:13). Lange found that parents would not accept reports based on individual growth but wanted their children graded on comparative performance (31:21). To summarize this portion of the chapter, the following statement seemed most appropriate:

It is likely, then, that most of the present systems of reporting pupil progress are more satisfactory to parents than educators generally realize (29:37).

The teachers in the Vale Elementary School in Cashmere, Washington, were stimulated by the resolution on reporting adopted at the October, 1967, meeting of the Washington Elementary School Principals Association (52:12). A committee of elementary teachers was formed during the 1967-1968 school year to investigate other forms of reporting and to make recommendations to the faculty of the Vale Elementary School. The purpose of this study arose from that move.

I. THE PROBLEM

In view of the two main facts stated above: (1) that the elementary educators in Cashmere were dissatisfied with the present system of reporting and were taking preliminary steps towards changing it, and (2) that parents were generally satisfied with the present reporting system, there was a need to determine the opinions of the Cashmere parents towards the present reporting system and reporting in general. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to elicit the opinions of the Cashmere parents and teachers towards the present reporting system and reporting in general and to ascertain whether the present reporting system used in the Vale Elementary School was meeting the needs of the community and school.

The major tool which was used to elicit the opinions of the parents and teachers was a questionnaire consisting of sixteen statements (see Appendix A). The parents and teachers marked each statement as to whether they strongly agreed, agreed, had no opinion, disagreed, or strongly disagreed. The main purpose of this study was to compare the opinions of the parents and teachers to reveal agreements and disagreements in opinion regarding the present reporting system and reporting in general.

II. SCOPE OF THE STUDY

This study was limited to the parents of the pupils who were enrolled in the Vale Elementary School on January 22, 1969, and to the faculty of the Vale School during the 1968-1969 school year. The Vale School contained kindergarten through fifth grade. The kindergarten was eliminated from the study because this grade did not use a formal report card to communicate with the parents. The questionnaire was seeking opinions regarding the present reporting system used in Cashmere and reporting in general.

III. DEFINITION OF TERMS USED

Ability. This is the skill, power, or talent to do something. For example, a child may have the ability to do a certain task but not be doing the task.

Achievement. This is what is actually done by a child. For example, a child may be working at a high level of achievement.

Conference. This is a meeting between parents and teacher to discuss one child and his total school behavior. Conferences may be scheduled for a particular time of the year or when the need arises.

Dual marking system. This is a system where a child is given two different marks or grades, usually one mark for achievement and the other for effort or ability.

Effort symbols. These are often used with the dual marking system. They indicate if a child is actually working up to his ability.

Grades or marks. These are notations like A, B, C, D, F or +, -, \checkmark that indicate how a child is doing.

Rating system or checklist. On this type of card, a number of items are listed. The teacher marks the items that are appropriate to the particular child.

Report card. This is a formal, written communication between the school and home. The main purpose of the report card is to inform the parents about the progress and growth or lack of progress and growth of their child in all aspects of the school curriculum.

Traditional reporting system. This is a system that tells how a child rates in achievement with reference to grade level standards. This rating may be expressed in percentage form or in letter grade form.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

In reviewing the available literature on the subject of "reporting," the researcher found much helpful information. Because of the abundance of information, an effort was made to use only sources less than ten years old. Hopefully, this review of literature will aid the reader in gaining an understanding of "reporting."

The topics which are included in this chapter are:

- (1) Rationale for Report Cards, (2) Types of Written Reports,
- (3) Trends in Reporting, (4) Faults of the Traditional System,
- and (5) Setting up a New Reporting System.

I. RATIONALE FOR REPORT CARDS

Rothney stated that marks are indispensable tools that have been used to measure school success for many years. He went on to say that marks have been the main basis for honor awards, promotions, and placement in schools (47:8). Klemm added the argument, in favor of report cards, that children want report cards so they can see what has been written about them and see how they are really doing in school (30:25). Klemm also pointed out that report cards are better than conferences because the latter are time-consuming and energy-consuming, poor conferences hurt the home-school relationship,

and conferences are difficult to schedule (30:25). Finally, Klemm made the statement that "teachers want it [a report card], too" (30:25).

In the past, some teachers have used grades as an easy way to motivate students. Neff suggested that this was one reason why some teachers wanted report cards (42:24). Bloom suspected that many teachers do not want to leave the traditional method of reporting because they do not want to accept the challenge of having to evaluate a student's potential and then deciding if he is working up to it (9:13).

A number of authors commented that parents generally find report cards to be satisfactory; whereas teachers are more likely to find fault with them (29:36-7; 45:9; 47:30; 54:50). Rothney also added that "for a long time to come parents will accept them as the basic evaluative device" (47:8). In summary, Klemm stressed that parents universally want a "card," one that is ". . . written, factual, formal, [and] structured . . ." (30:25).

The Long Beach, California, Schools maintained that although parents and educators often disagree about the value of report cards, educators must remember that ". . . every parent has the right to know in understandable terms how his child is succeeding in school" (34:1). This school district also emphasized that school reports can help improve the image that parents have of the school (34:2).

II. TYPES OF WRITTEN REPORTS

Hockstad described the traditional system of reporting as a system that told how a child rated in achievement with reference to grade standards or to a national standard (26:174). The mark was usually a letter or numeral distributed entirely within a given class of students. This method of reporting assumed that some pupils must fail, a few students will achieve top marks, and most students will get mediocre scores (8:5).

Edwin Anderson commented that the diagnostic card may be traditional in that a grade is given for achievement in each subject. However, he explained that under each subject there is a checklist which shows development in the basic objectives for each subject. Furthermore, he claimed that this card gives clues to reasons for letter marks and may suggest ways that the student can improve (5:22).

In describing a different report card, Edwin Anderson felt that the checklist card is "mechanically the most usable of the various departures from the traditional card" (5:21). He stated that it is the simplest way to report more information in less time and with less effort. However, he did note one drawback to the checklist card: It may be too detailed, too lengthy, and too much for parents to digest (5:21). Houghie wondered if these checklists should be individualized for each child and if the child should take part in the evaluation (27:16).

One school district, by using a checklist format, computerized their report cards. There were forty-four concise comments, which teachers had used on past report cards, listed on the computerized card. The teachers marked the comments that were appropriate to each child for each subject matter area. The teachers felt that this card was time-saving, more straight-forward, more consistent, and more comprehensive than past report cards. However, the parents needed a conference to further explain the report card and wanted the card to be more personal (38:129).

In one kindergarten, each child made a booklet with each page devoted to a single skill. A sentence explained that skill and a sample of the child's work illustrated how well he performed that skill. No attempt was made to grade the booklets. The booklets were shown to parents at conferences (19:38).

In 1964, Hammel noted that the dual marking system was becoming popular in many school districts. Under this system, a child received one grade for achievement in terms of group norms and a second grade for growth in terms of his potentialities and effort (25:51). Advocates of this system claimed that it was easier for parents to understand the meaning of a child's grades (29:37).

Halliwell stated that this system represented a compromise between the traditional objective and the modern

pupil-centered approach to grading. He felt that it may be more meaningful to parents and fairer to pupils (23:245).

Halliwell also pointed out several inadequacies of the dual marking system. First, teachers were not capable of marking students objectively. He stated, ". . . a mark on a report card may be a function of the child's intelligence, sex, teacher, and class as well as the effort he expends" (23:247). Secondly, teachers were not able to appraise effort adequately (24:141). In summary, Halliwell and Robitaille found in their study that ". . . the teachers are grading pupils in the traditional manner on the individualized part of the report card . . ." (24:141). Thus, the bright pupils were rewarded twice with good grades and the slow pupils were punished twice with poor grades (24:141).

Yauch suggested that teachers use the type of report card that each parent wants. He proposed that the teacher meet the parent in a conference and report the child's progress through talking. If the parent still wanted a report card, the teacher could then put the information down in the form that best pleases that individual parent (54:58).

III. TRENDS IN REPORTING

Hammel listed four reasons for the demand of modern reporting systems: (1) a basic dissatisfaction with reporting procedures, (2) a more sophisticated knowledge of children,

(3) the expanding curriculum, and (4) attempts to make reporting of pupil progress more valid and meaningful (25:50).

In 1961, the following trends were reported by one author. The report cards were developing certain common characteristics such as, teacher's comments, grades, and descriptions of behavior. The most common frequency of issuance was six times a year. Many school districts were using other devices to supplement the formal reports. In many cases, parents were helping to revise the cards. Report cards were becoming uniform throughout a school district. Finally, in the past five years, fifty-two per cent of the schools sampled had made major revisions in their reporting system (54:58). In 1967, the NEA Research Division reported that eighty per cent of the elementary schools sampled indicated that they used a traditional A-F type of report card (41:51).

Klemm reported that there seemed to be no agreement as to which grade level should have subject-matter grades on the report cards as differing from those grade levels with no subject-matter grades on the report cards (30:25). A few other trends regarding reporting were: (1) the term "progress report" is being used more often than "report card," (2) reports to parents vary at succeeding levels, (3) no one card has been effective in all schools, and (4) the topic of reporting requires understanding by all concerned (7:661).

Misner suggested that one trend, which could be used with any type of written report card, is that of staggered report cards. He defined this as merely a method of sending the report cards home at any time over a one to two month period (39:11). Several authors declared that one of the greatest advantages to this method is the minimizing of comparisons among students (6:11; 34:8; and 39:11). Another advantage to the method of staggered report cards mentioned by several authors is that it spreads out the paperwork and preparation for the teacher over a longer period of time (6:11; 34:8).

Robert Anderson explained that the first cards sent home under this method were those that concerned children with problems or where there existed a need to develop familiarity between the teacher and parent. The other cards that did not involve a special need or urgency were sent home at the end of the reporting period (6:10-11).

As late as 1968, Chadwick stated that marks have great influence on children's lives:

. . . yet there is less agreement, less teacher-preparation, and less helpful professional literature to aid teachers in reporting on children than there is about any other phase of the educational program (13:22).

IV. FAULTS OF THE TRADITIONAL SYSTEM

The traditional reporting system prided itself on being an objective measure of achievement. Hammel listed such things as the philosophy of a school system, the aims in various subject fields, the character of the local pupil population, and the report card itself as formal factors that assured some degree of unanimity in reporting pupil progress (25:51). But, then, he listed a number of informal factors which sometimes circumvented the influence of the formal factors: (1) inadequacy of teachers in evaluating all subjects; (2) personal variations from the formal marking system; (3) varying reactions of teachers to sex, income, and family attitudes; (4) a sharper, more critical evaluation in the fall with a softening evaluation in the spring; (5) the previous marks of a child; and (6) the difficulty of special teachers (music or art, for example) in evaluating numerous children whom they see for only a short time (25:52).

Amsden and Terwilliger found in their study that over fifty per cent of the teachers sampled gave consideration to behavior, absences, tardiness, and effort in determining subject matter grades (3:34). May stated that:

Traditional marks are not accurate reports of student progress in achievement because factors other than achievement, e.g., behavior, personality, adjustment, working relationships, etc., consciously or unconsciously affect the evaluation of the student (37:15).

Alexander noted the following influences that affect achievement: (1) developmental factors, (2) emotional climate in the home and peer relationships, (3) socio-economic factors, (4) teacher-pupil relationships, and (5) perception of school (2:110). Finally, Matlin and Mendelshon pointed out that ". . . teachers tend to base their grades on adjustment as well as accomplishment" (36:459).

In summary, Hockstad stressed that grades are neither scientifically nor objectively defined (26:175). May added that teachers cannot objectively evaluate and mark student progress in achievement (37:15). Chadwick concluded that even an objective marking system ends up being a subjective evaluation (13:22).

Hockstad pointed out another fault of the traditional reporting system: many report cards do not make known the basis for evaluation (26:174-175). Boehm and White mentioned that pupils may be concerned about their academic standings, but often lacked feedback about the meaning of marking systems (10:240). Slocomb argued that a standardized grading system is necessary so a child does not have to meet different sets of arbitrary ideals with each instructor (49:20). "When the method [of establishing marks] is not made crystal clear to the student, the report card becomes an area for speculation" (43:75). White and Boehm explained that children will

attempt to translate the teachers' evaluation systems into systems they can understand and ones that help them to determine their status in the classroom (53:13).

Pemberton stated that not only do just the students get confused by varying marking systems, but the use of different standards of grading by different teachers combined with the briefness of report cards tends to perplex the parents too (43:75).

Cutler suggested several reasons why there are variations in marking systems. First, some teachers do not apply a consistent standard and grades vary in direct relation to these teachers. Secondly, teachers may not understand the forms they have to fill out. Thirdly, a teacher may have to make a judgement that goes beyond the information she has (15:60). Kingston and Wash thought that other trouble arises when uncommon and different criteria for pupil evaluation exists in the same school (29:37). Several authors felt that still another problem arises when ability grouping is used. The grades for these pupils must be realistic and meaningful (29:37; 46). Amsden and Terwilliger found that very few of the schools sampled in their study had formalized policies for grading in subjects where homogeneous grouping existed (3:34).

Heffernan pointed out that grades on a report card only measure a small amount of a child's ability (16:23).

Anastasiow noted that there is too much to communicate through the medium of a report card (4:209). Finally, two authors emphasized that the mark on a report card is a summary of a complex evaluation which cannot be interpreted clearly (37:15; 46).

Many authors have pointed out the fact that the traditional grading system helps the top students and hurts the low students (46). However, as asserted by the Bellevue Public Schools, the traditional grading system also hurts the top students. For example, this school district maintained that a gifted child soon finds out how little he has to do in order to get a top mark (8:6). Austin pointed out that, ". . . pupils prodded by adults (including teachers) worked to obtain good grades or to 'get by'" (7:661). Finally, Halliwell stated, "Thus, with the traditional reporting program, the bright pupil is frequently rewarded for indolence . . ." (24:137).

Very little seems to have been written about the traditional grading system and the average students. Two authors expressed concern that the average students may not be receiving adequate teacher feedback and do not know where they stand in class. They thought that the average students were the ones who were most confused by the varied systems of marking used on their daily work (53:13).

The following quotation summed up much of the information which was written about the traditional reporting system and the low students: ". . . the system 'picks on' those children who are least fit to be picked on" (40:11). Munden also stated that this system penalizes children for not succeeding. He argued that the low students are continually provided with evidence of their failure (40:11). The Bellevue Public Schools claimed that children are more able to compete through building success upon success rather than failure on failure (8:1). Furthermore, this school district declared that if a child has to achieve beyond his level of capacity to make a passing mark, he is doomed to constant and inevitable failure (8:6). Again, this district stated that a child will only fail when he realizes there is no way he can succeed (8:8). Finally, Chadwick explained that a failing mark does not spur a child to do better work and a child is not encouraged by this type of marking system (13:23).

Alexander pointed out that the low ability student can seldom hope to get an average grade or better. School, for this child, is one failure experience after another. The marking system just points out his continued failure (2:112).

Drews mentioned the fact that healthy children want to grow and change and are proud of positive signs they can point to. She emphasized, however, that repeated failures and no

visible indications of progress can make a child apathetic and uncaring of how he does (17:52).

Alexander stated, "Thus, under pressure of failure, people tend to get so involved in anxiety over their feelings about themselves, that their efficiency of achievement suffers" (2:111).

Finally, Bogdanovich found in his studies that the pupils who received the lowest grades and needed special help seldom had parents who made any effort to see the teacher (11:1).

In summing up the damage done to the low pupils by the traditional reporting system, a quote from Halliwell seemed most appropriate: ". . . the slow pupil is frequently penalized for effort" (24:137).

Many authors have asserted that traditional grading is detrimental to learning (7:661; 8:1; 16:87; 37:15; 40:11). Alexander proposed that the belief, that marks are an incentive to study and learn, came about through two false assumptions. First, students will work harder and learn better to get higher grades. Secondly, marks are a reward for better students and a means of realistic evaluation for all students. Actually, Alexander felt that marks were a barrier to learning (2:110).

Several authors advanced that one of the reasons there is so much opposition to marks is that marks are often based on the acquisition of knowledge rather than the application of knowledge (16:23; 37:15). Hockstad stated that marks put an emphasis on subjects and not on the learner and that the real purpose of education and the real outcome of learning are concealed by marks (26:174). Another author pointed out that the over-emphasis on grading gets in the way of personalizing instruction, evaluation, and guidance (31:20).

May claimed that the poor achiever is likely to develop anxiety due to marks. This anxiety may lead to further failure and actual withdrawal from some learning situations. Thus, marks can be a barrier to the acquisition of knowledge of a poor achiever (37:16).

In an entirely different manner, White claimed that the learning of high achievers may also be hindered by marks. He explained that if a student earns all A's, it does not necessarily mean a true education or a special intelligence. All A's may indicate docility, a capacity to remember and repeat the insignificant, or a ferocious willingness to grind away (16:102-103). The Bellevue Public Schools pointed out that high achievers may also be impeded in their acquisition of knowledge because marks imply rigid standards and a sharply defined curricula (8:5).

In summary, Lange made a statement pointing up the main idea of this last section of Chapter II:

The main trouble with most school marks and grading is that the grading process gets in the way of good instruction and thus actually subverts the curriculum. . . . many schools . . . put more time and energy into "sorting" and "grading" students than they put into teaching them (31:19).

The Cashmere Elementary School Report Cards pointed out that report cards are intended to be one of the lines of communication between the school and home that can help the child to improve (see Appendixes D and E). However, one author has questioned the usefulness of the traditional report card in helping parents to understand their children's development and progress (39:10). As two different authors have illustrated, many traditional cards are one-way affairs and are limited in information (11:1-2; 47:8-9). Also, Bogdanovich maintained that plans to overcome weaknesses are not accomplished through report cards (11:1-2).

Rothney and May both stressed the fact that the traditional report card does not inform the child of the points on which he needs to improve (37:16; 47:8-9). Other authors have emphasized that often, the report card may only describe the weaknesses of a child and not recognize his good qualities (15:60; 17:20; and 26:175). Finally, Alexander pointed out that a student cannot evaluate himself under the traditional method of reporting but has to depend on the judgement of

others. Alexander explained that extrinsic evaluation of a failure experience (the type of evaluation under the traditional method of grading) leads only to being a failure. Intrinsic evaluation of a failure experience may lead to insight into the limitations of one's ability (2:112-113).

Much emphasis has been placed on developing the individuality of each child in our school systems (12:16-17; 18:1; 20:246; 21:547). However, the Bellevue Public Schools claimed that traditional marking can be detrimental to fostering individuality because a comparative marking system may foster a conformist attitude toward life (8:1). Doll pointed out that many schools cater to conforming high achievers and do nothing with low achievers (16:5). Munden added that comparative marking systems have no regard for individual dignity (40:11). Several authors stated that the creative, unique, and original students are often forced through memorizing, recall, and repeat to conform to the school's standards (2:112; 37:15).

Link declared that a report card may mean the following things to a child. First, it may be the source of privileges bestowed or taken away from him. Secondly, it may be the primary source of feeling successful or unsuccessful. Thirdly, it has the power to make parents and students proud and ashamed. Fourthly, the report card has great manipulating power. Finally, it can make a child a puppet (33:11).

Munden stated that the comparative grading system warps the moral values of students (40:12). Austin expressed fear that the traditional reporting system may cause cheating and cramming among students (7:661).

Heffernan pointed out that with the overemphasis on grades and academic education, there may result a lessened interest in the cultural aspects of living (16:23).

Austin proposed that, instead of helping their children, parents use report cards to bribe their children, cajole them, promote competition, and withdraw love and reassurance (7:661). Bogdanovich added that parents use report cards to give out punishment and rewards (11:1-2).

In summary, Raubinger stated:

The heavy emphasis on grades, test scores, and ranks in class which has developed in recent years has resulted in a kind of junior rat race in which the prime object is to achieve, at whatever cost, a high standing (16:87).

The comparative (traditional) method of grading apparently grew out of the assumption that all students were equally able to do a given task if they were old enough and were in the right grade (17:20). Parents have argued that if children are going to live in a competitive world, they might as well get used to it (16:84). However, a number of authors have maintained that most adults do not realize the damage that is being done to young children by the highly competitive, rigidly structured school world (6:10; 37:15; 39:10; 40:12; 47:9).

Roth stated in a speech at Central Washington State College that it takes more energy to compete, and thus, competition may destroy some children (46). Heffernan enlarged on this idea by stating that some children do not have the physical and emotional maturity to withstand extra pressures in their lives such as pressures for grades, for formal report cards, for rigid marking systems, and for rigid standards (16:23). Link believed that all students worry about grades. He thought students developed tension because they knew that grades became a part of their permanent record (33:12). McGuigan explained that children are not equipped naturally for continuing emotional tension. He stated that the emotional impact of competition on a child can be severe (16:49). The Bellevue Public Schools stressed the point that the low-achieving students are very susceptible to the devastating effects of competition. Comparison with more competent students and thus, striving for unrealistic goals will lead them to personal failure (8:8).

In summary, McGuigan emphasized that competition will most likely continue to be favored by many adults because it is the adult concept of what a child needs and wants (16:48).

Much emphasis has been placed on the point that grades are a predictor of future success (1:59; 14:430; 32:623; 45:9; 47:8). A number of authors refuted the above statement (37:15). Hoyt found that high college grades were not a good

basis for predicting success after college graduation.

". . . college grades tend to measure the amount of knowledge acquired by the student, while achievement as an adult depends on the individual's ability to use knowledge effectively" (28:275). The Long Beach, California, Schools explained that experience in life may show that the extent to which a person works up to his ability is as important as ability itself (34:5).

Finally, Bloom emphasized that an "A" student may have an excellent memory, excellent set of nerves, and an ability to arise to the occasion when a test comes along. However, he may not be able to apply this knowledge. On the other hand, the "D" student may not be able to retain knowledge but may know where to look for information and how to use it (9:13).

V. SETTING UP A NEW REPORTING SYSTEM

In this section of Chapter II, several ideas and suggestions will be presented that may be of use to other school districts in establishing a new reporting system. Most of the ideas have come from related literature; however, a few suggestions that have developed from the present study will also be included.

Schinbeckler pointed out that the first step in setting up a new reporting system is to secure administrative

approval. Once this has been done, an extensive bibliography for a reading background should be compiled (48:19-20).

Secondly, Anastasiow felt that the effectiveness of the present report card should be evaluated (4:210). This can be done through use of a questionnaire, conferences with parents, or P. T. A. meetings. Theriault explained that if a questionnaire is used, it may be sent to both the parents and teachers. Then, the results may be compared between the two groups (51:3).

Schinbeckler emphasized that next, the results of this evaluation should be discussed with all teachers and administrators (48:21). He added that, at this time, formal reports on various topics concerned with reporting may be made at faculty meetings, some books which relate to the topic of reporting may be purchased by the district, and visits may be made to other school districts to observe their reporting methods (48:22).

Schinbeckler also stressed that parents should be involved in the change-making. He set forth several ways of involving the parents. One way would be to introduce the idea of changing the reporting system at a P. T. A. meeting. The parents could be divided into groups to discuss the topic and then the parents could appoint a committee to work with the teachers (48:38). Another method of involving parents would be by having homeroom teachers explain the idea of

changing the reporting system to the parents. Then, perhaps one parent from each homeroom could be involved with a committee of teachers (48:34). Finally, Phelps contributed one other way of involving the parents: school officials could explain the idea of changing the reporting system at a school meeting. Then the parents could submit written suggestions concerning the idea (44:73).

Kingston and Wash pointed out that whatever method is used of involving the parents, it is a step that must not be left out. Schools should get parents to help in changing the reporting system, perhaps not for the actual value in solving technical problems but more for improved public relations and acceptance of a new reporting system (29:37). Bogdanovich pointed out that schools need to involve the whole community yet go about it cautiously. He added that the schools must gain the support of those who are doubtful, hesitant, or skeptical about any changes (11:18). Finally, Edwin Anderson stated that any changes need to be built on understanding of the basic principles by all of those who will be using the new reporting system (5:7).

Once a new reporting system has been developed, the Bellevue Public Schools emphasized that it is extremely important that the school district fully inform the teachers and parents of the objectives and techniques of the new reporting system (8:5). The Long Beach, California, Schools

added that the meaning of words and symbols should be interpreted clearly to all teachers and parents (34:10). This same district also stated that the principal should plan with his staff some adequate method of informing all parents of the new changes. Perhaps, through a faculty meeting, the staff can arrange either grade level meetings or a general meeting with parents (34:10). Another method advocated by this district would be to explain the new reporting system at individual parent-teacher conferences. This school district asserted that a written summary of all points covered at these meetings or conferences should be sent to those parents who were unable to attend the meetings or conferences (34:10). One other method of informing parents of changes in a reporting system was presented by Theriault. This method would involve sending a letter of explanation home with the new report card (51:3). However, as this method may be a less effective method of informing parents, perhaps it should be used in conjunction with one of the other methods mentioned above.

The Long Beach, California, Schools stressed that interpreting the reporting system must be thought of as a continuous responsibility of the school district. New parents to the district must also be informed of the purpose of the report cards and the meaning of the words and symbols on the

card (34:10). In the same manner, Mahler and Fox pointed out that new teachers to the district should get a thorough understanding of the reporting system (35:23).

Anastasiow mentioned that once a new reporting system has been put into use, an attempt should be made to assess how well the new system is meeting the needs of the community (4:210). Schinbeckler suggested that a follow-up questionnaire could be used to determine how closely the new system is attaining the purpose set up for it (48:45). Phelps thought that parents could make suggestions at parent-teacher conferences regarding the new system (44:73). Again, Mahler and Fox stated that the principal should check to make sure that all of the teachers are really using the correct system of reporting (35:23).

Finally, Anastasiow explained that when the follow-up evaluation has been completed and the results have been reported to all people concerned, perhaps more changes and a modified card will be put into use. He concluded that evaluation and change will continue in what should be a never-ending process (4:210).

VI. SUMMARY

The purpose of this chapter was to focus upon "reporting." However, the researcher does not claim to have completely exhausted all aspects of those topics included in

this chapter. If the reader is interested in pursuing any of these topics, numerous sources are listed in the Bibliography.

The section of this chapter on Setting Up a New Reporting System may be valuable to other school districts which are contemplating a change in their reporting system.

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES

At the time of this study, 1967-1969, the Cashmere Public Schools used a separate report card for grades one, two, and three (primary) and grades four and five (intermediate). The report cards were issued four times a year with a conference supplementing the fall issuance of the report cards.

On the primary card there were twelve main categories such as reading, mathematics, and study habits with several subheadings under each main category. Each child was marked according to how he compared with other children in his class on each subheading. If the child was doing "above average," he received a plus (+) on that item on the report card. If he was doing "average," he received a check (✓) on that item on the report card. Finally, if he "needed to improve," he received a minus (-) on that item on the report card (see Appendix D).

The teachers used a dual marking system on the intermediate card (grades four and five). A, B, C, D, and F marks were used to indicate achievement in terms of grade level standards. Effort grades were indicated by a one, two, or three. There were eleven main categories on the intermediate card with several subheadings under each main category (see Appendix E).

This project was approved by the Superintendent of Schools in Cashmere and the principal of the Vale Elementary School in December, 1968.

The questionnaire was prepared mainly during the summer of 1968 with the help of college faculty and students in the researcher's Education 507 class at Central Washington State College. During the fall of 1968, several changes were suggested by the faculty of the Vale School.

During Christmas vacation, 1968, the questionnaire was pretested with five parents living in the town of South Bend, Washington. Each of these parents had a child or children enrolled in the South Bend Elementary School which uses a report card similar to that used in the Cashmere Elementary School. Each of the five parents in South Bend read through the questionnaire in the author's presence. The purpose of this was to insure that the instructions were clear and that each statement could be understood by parents, not just by teachers. Changes were made in three statements as a result of this pretest.

Several small changes were made in the wording on six statements for the teachers' questionnaires. Also, the first statement on the questionnaire was eliminated from the teachers' questionnaires (see Appendix B).

The questionnaire was now completed. The final copy was typed by the Vale Elementary secretary.

The questionnaires were distributed to the faculty at a special meeting held on January 20, 1969. The researcher explained the purpose of the study and gave the following instructions to the faculty:

1. Each teacher was asked to put a questionnaire in the second quarter report card folder for each child in his class.
2. On Wednesday, January 22, the day report cards went home, each teacher was to remind his students to return the questionnaire with the report card.
3. Each teacher was asked to either give the parents' returned questionnaires to the researcher in person or place them in his mailbox in the school office.
4. Each teacher was asked to fill out a questionnaire and write "teacher" at the top of it. These questionnaires were also to be returned to the researcher or placed in his mailbox.

On Wednesday, January 22, the questionnaires were sent home to the parents with the second quarter report cards. By Friday, January 24, eighty questionnaires had been returned to the researcher. On Friday, January 31, the faculty was reminded through the daily bulletin to give all returned questionnaires to the researcher. By February 3, another 110 questionnaires had been returned to the researcher. During the next week, five more questionnaires were returned.

The total number of parents' questionnaires returned was 195. There were 253 families having pupils enrolled in the Vale School on January 22, 1969. Thus, seventy-seven

per cent of the parents' questionnaires were returned. One hundred per cent of the faculty's questionnaires were returned.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA

The parents and teachers were able to indicate their opinions of each statement on the questionnaire by marking one of the following choices: Strongly Agree, Agree, No Opinion, Disagree, and Strongly Disagree (see Appendixes F and G). For reasons of convenience in tabulation, the results were grouped into just three categories. The responses that were marked for Strongly Disagree and Disagree were grouped into one category which, from here on, will be called Disagree. The responses that were marked for Strongly Agree and Agree were grouped into one category which, from here on, will be called Agree. The third category remained as it was before, No Opinion (see Appendixes H and I).

For each group, that is, parents and teachers, the total number of responses marked for Agree, Disagree, and No Opinion on each statement were changed into percentages (see Table I, page 36, and Table 2, page 37). In the following section of this chapter, the percentages of parents and teachers who marked either Agree or Disagree on each statement will be compared and discussed (see Appendix J). Literature which is relevant to each statement and the opinions expressed about that statement will be mentioned.

TABLE I
 PERCENTAGE OF PARENTS' RESPONSES ON EACH STATEMENT:
 THREE CHOICES

State- ment	Agree	Dis- agree	No Opinion	State- ment	Agree	Dis- agree	No Opinion
1	79	20	1	9	50	35	14
2	90	8	2	10	21	68	11
3	81	18	1	11	87	9	4
4	4	93	4	12	39	47	13
5	48	44	8	13	27	53	20
6	32	62	6	14	31	42	26
7	28	67	5	15	2	84	14
8	61	32	7	16	20	70	10

TABLE II

PERCENTAGE OF TEACHERS' RESPONSES ON EACH STATEMENT:
THREE CHOICES

State- ment	Agree	Dis- agree	No Opinion	State- ment	Agree	Dis- agree	No Opinion
1	Teachers did not respond			9	27	73	0
2	80	13	7	10	7	86	7
3	67	33	0	11	86	14	0
4	20	80	0	12	13	87	0
5	13	87	0	13	53	33	13
6	7	93	0	14	67	27	7
7	0	100	0	15	0	100	0
8	27	73	0	16	93	7	0

Statement Number One. The report card tells you what you want to know about your child or children's growth.

Seventy-nine per cent of the parents marked Agree while twenty per cent marked Disagree. The teachers did not mark this statement. The high percentage on Agree for the parents followed the statement made in Chapter II that parents generally find report cards to be satisfactory (29:36-37; 45:9; 54:50).

Statement Number Two. The language used on the report card is easy to understand.

Both parents and teachers seemed to be in agreement on this statement, as is shown by these percentages:

	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>No Opinion</u>
Parents	90	8	2
Teachers	80	13	7

Apparently, in the past, the school has done a sufficient job in interpreting the meaning of words and symbols on the report card to the parents (34:10). Also, it seemed apparent that new teachers to the district have gained an understanding of the reporting system and the report cards (35:23).

Statement Number Three. The present system of reporting four times a year is sufficient to keep you informed of your child or children's growth and progress.

Again, both groups seemed to be in agreement on this statement, as is shown by these percentages:

	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>No Opinion</u>
Parents	81	18	1
Teachers	67	33	0

Yauch stated that the most common frequency of issuance of report cards was six times a year (54:58). The high percentage of parents marking Agree seemed to indicate that the reporting system was meeting their needs. However, one third of the teachers marked Disagree. This may have been one indication that the teachers felt a need for a change in the reporting system.

Statement Number Four. There is too much information on the report card.

On this statement, both groups seemed to be in agreement, as is shown by these percentages:

	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>No Opinion</u>
Parents	4	93	4
Teachers	20	80	0

Because of the wording of this statement, the percentages were interpreted in two ways. Possibly, both groups were of the opinion that the report card had the right amount of information on it. Secondly, maybe the percentages indicated that there was not enough information on the report card.

This second interpretation was in agreement with the statement that grades measure only a small amount of ability (16:23) and with the statement that there is too much to communicate through the medium of a report card (4:209; 11:1-2; 47:8-9).

Statement Number Five. The report card provides adequate two-way communication between school and home and home and school.

This was the first statement where a real discrepancy appeared between the parents and teachers, as is shown by these percentages:

	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>No Opinion</u>
Parents	48	44	8
Teachers	13	87	0

The teachers seemed to realize that report cards are one-way affairs and limited in information (11:1-2; 43:75; 47:8-9). The parents were divided about half and half on this statement. Their opinions seemed to point up the fact that parents generally find report cards to be satisfactory; whereas, teachers are more likely to find fault with them (29:36-37; 45:9; 47:30; 54:50).

Statement Number Six. The report card shows reasons for unsatisfactory growth or lack of achievement.

Both groups indicated a fault in the report cards, as is shown by these percentages:

	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>No Opinion</u>
Parents	32	62	6
Teachers	7	93	0

These opinions corresponded with the statement that the mark on a report card cannot be interpreted clearly (37:15; 46), and with the statement that there is too much to communicate through the medium of a report card (4:209). The percentage of parents who indicated that they Agree may be due again to the fact that parents generally find report cards to be satisfactory (29:36-37; 45:9; 47:30; 54:50).

However, the sixty-two per cent of the parents who disagreed with this statement seemed to contradict the seventy-nine per cent of the parents who agreed with Statement Number One (The report card tells you what you want to know about your child or children's growth).

Statement Number Seven. The report card tells you what you can do to help your child.

Again, both groups seemed to point out another fault in the report card, as is shown by these percentages:

	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>No Opinion</u>
Parents	28	67	5
Teachers	0	100	0

The opinions expressed through this statement were in agreement with several authors. For example, Bogdanovich stated that plans to overcome weaknesses are not accomplished through report cards (11:1-2). Pemberton pointed out that the briefness of report cards tends to perplex parents (43:75). May and Roth both mentioned the fact that the mark on a report card is a summary of a complex evaluation that cannot be interpreted clearly (37:15; 46). Finally, two different authors asserted that parents may actually hurt their children rather than help them through the report cards (7:661;11:1-2).

Again, the sixty-seven per cent of the parents who disagreed with this statement seemed to contradict the seventy-nine per cent of the parents who agreed with Statement Number One (The report card tells you what you want to know about your child or children's growth).

Statement Number Eight. Your child or children gain understanding of their strong and weak points from the report card.

This was the second statement which pointed up an actual discrepancy between the parents and teachers, as is shown by these percentages:

	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>No Opinion</u>
Parents	61	32	7
Teachers	27	73	0

Over half of the parents agreed with the statement whereas almost three-fourths of the teachers disagreed. Much was written in Chapter II concerning this statement (2:112-13; 10:240; 15:60; 17:20, 52; 26:174; 43:75; 53:13). Generally, the above authors all agreed that the traditional report card does not inform the child of the points on which he needs to improve (37:16; 47:8-9). However, as Klemm reported, children want report cards so they can see how they are really doing in school (30:24).

Statement Number Nine. The report card clearly shows the basis for evaluation.

This was the third statement which pointed out a discrepancy between the parents and teachers, as is shown by these percentages:

	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>No Opinion</u>
Parents	50	35	14
Teachers	27	73	0

Half of the parents agreed with this statement while almost three-fourths of the teachers disagreed. Again, much was written in Chapter II concerning this statement (2:110; 3:34; 13:22; 25:52; 26:175; 36:459; 37:15). Possibly, the difference in opinions expressed by the parents and teachers was due to the fact that the teachers had a better understanding of how the evaluating of children was done in the Vale Elementary School.

Statement Number Ten. Your child or children should be evaluated in terms of how they compare with their classmates in each subject.

Both groups seemed to concur that they were not in favor of grading by comparison, as is shown by these percentages:

	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>No Opinion</u>
Parents	21	68	11
Teachers	7	86	7

This agreed with much literature that has been written on grading (8:1-27; 13:22-28; 16:1-109; 34:1-13; 37:15; 40:11-12; 46; 52:12).

However, the opinions expressed by the parents on this statement seemed to contradict the opinions expressed on Statement Number One (The report card tells you what you want to know about your child or children's growth). Seventy-nine per cent of the parents agreed with Statement Number One while sixty-eight per cent of the parents disagreed with Statement Number Ten. The report cards that were used in the Vale School at the time of this study definitely had grades that were based solely on comparisons between pupils (see Appendixes D and E).

Statement Number Eleven. Your child or children should be evaluated in terms of their own ability in each subject.

Both groups seemed to concur that they were in favor of evaluation on individual ability, as is shown by these percentages:

	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>No Opinion</u>
Parents	87	9	4
Teachers	86	14	0

This, too, agreed with much of the literature that has been written on grading (8:1; 9:13-14; 17:52; 29:37; 34:5).

Again, the opinions expressed by the parents on this statement seemed to contradict the opinions expressed in Statement Number One (The report card tells you what you want to know about your child or children's growth). Seventy-nine per cent of the parents agreed with Statement Number One while eighty-seven per cent of the parents agreed with Statement Number Eleven. The report cards that were used in the Vale School at the time of this study did not have grades based on evaluation of individual ability.

Statement Number Twelve. The marks on the report card are a good indication of your child or children's future success in school and life.

The teachers seemed to be more aware of the actual relationship between grades and achievement in life, as is shown by these percentages:

	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>No Opinion</u>
Parents	39	47	13
Teachers	13	87	0

Several authors have claimed that it is one thing to have knowledge as shown by grades but another thing to be able to apply knowledge (9:13; 16:23; 28:275; 34:5; 37:15).

Rothney stated quite well why thirty-nine per cent of the parents agreed with this statement: "For a long time to come parents will accept them [marks on a report card] as the basic evaluative device" (47:8).

Statement Number Thirteen. The report card tends to promote excessive competition among children.

Neither group showed strong opinions on this statement, as is indicated by these percentages:

	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>No Opinion</u>
Parents	27	53	20
Teachers	53	33	13

In fact, twenty per cent of the parents and thirteen per cent of the teachers marked No Opinion on this statement. Link believed that all students worry about grades (33:12). Thus, some competition may result from report cards. Perhaps one-third of the teachers disagreed with this statement because they did not want to think of themselves as causing competition among students for grades. The fifty-three per cent of

the parents who disagreed pointed up an unusual fact. Rubinger and McGuigan commented that adults usually favor competition for children (16:48, 84).

Statement Number Fourteen. The report card causes children to work for good grades rather than to develop the ability to use knowledge effectively.

The two groups were divided in their opinion on this statement, as is shown by these percentages:

	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>No Opinion</u>
Parents	31	42	26
Teachers	67	27	7

The teachers seemed to realize how the top students may only do enough to get by (7:661; 8:6; 16:23; 37:15). Also, a number of authors have emphasized how grades interfere with learning (2:110; 8:5; 16:87, 103; 26:174; 31:20; 37:16; 53:103).

Statement Number Fifteen. A certain number of children in each class should receive failing marks on their report cards.

Both groups concurred that pointing out to a child that he is a failure should not be a part of the Vale School report cards. This is shown by the following percentages:

	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>No Opinion</u>
Parents	2	84	14
Teachers	0	100	0

This, too, was in agreement with a number of authors (2:112; 8:1, 6; 13:23; 17:52; 37:16).

However, the opinions expressed by the parents on this statement seemed to contradict the opinions expressed on Statement Number One (The report card tells you what you want to know about your child or children's growth). Seventy-nine per cent of the parents agreed with Statement Number One while eighty-four per cent of the parents disagreed with Statement Number Fifteen. At the time of this study, some students did receive "failing" marks on their report cards.

Statement Number Sixteen. The top students benefit more from report cards than do the lower students.

The teachers indicated a very high percentage agreeing and the parents indicated a high percentage disagreeing, as is shown by these percentages:

	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>No Opinion</u>
Parents	20	70	10
Teachers	93	7	0

Apparently, the teachers were more aware of the fact that the traditional grading system tends to help the top students and hurt the low students (24:137, 141; 40:11; 46).

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In this chapter a brief summary of the study is presented. Several conclusions which derived from the data are stated. Finally, a number of recommendations are made to the Vale Elementary School faculty in Cashmere.

I. SUMMARY

In 1967-1968, the faculty of the Vale Elementary School in Cashmere, Washington, was taking preliminary steps towards changing the reporting system. However, because a number of authors have pointed out that parents were generally satisfied with the present reporting system (5:13; 29:37; 31:21; 45:9; 47:30), the researcher felt that there was a need to determine the opinions of the Cashmere parents and teachers towards the present reporting system and reporting in general.

A questionnaire consisting of sixteen statements was prepared for the parents and teachers. Both groups filled out the questionnaire in January, 1969. A total of 195 parents' questionnaires were returned to the researcher. This represented seventy-seven per cent of the parents' questionnaires. One hundred per cent of the teachers' questionnaires were returned to the researcher.

The opinions that were expressed on each statement were compared between the parents and teachers to find areas of agreement and disagreement.

II. CONCLUSIONS

The results of the questionnaire seemed to indicate that the parents and teachers of Cashmere were not as divided in their opinions about report cards and grading as parents and teachers in some other communities have been (29:36-37; 47:30; 54:50).

However, because the parents indicated on Statement Number One that the report card did generally tell them what they wanted to know, the faculty of the Vale School should proceed very cautiously with their plans for changing the present reporting system.

Ninety per cent of the parents indicated that they understood the language used on the report card. Because of several contradictions in opinions, the question arose as to whether the parents really understood the language used on the report card. For example, the opinions of the parents seemed to indicate that they did not really understand how their children were being evaluated, even though this was stated on the report cards. Also, the parents did not seem to understand what purposes the report cards served. This, too, was stated on the report cards.

In conclusion, the possibility exists that the parents did not understand the language used on some of the statements on the questionnaire. This, too, could have led to contradictions in opinions.

If the Vale School faculty continues with their plans for changing the present reporting system, the recommendations in this study should be given careful consideration before any other progress is made.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

On the basis of the opinions expressed about Statements Number Ten, Eleven, and Fifteen, the Vale School faculty should continue with their plans to adopt a new grading system and report cards. This grading system should be based on the idea that children will be evaluated in terms of their own ability in each subject.

Parent-teacher conferences should be continued. This will provide better communication between school and home and home and school. This need for improved communications was indicated by the opinions expressed on Statements Number One, Three, and Five. Also, twenty-seven parents wrote in the comment that they were in favor of parent-teacher conferences.

The new report card should show reasons for unsatisfactory growth or lack of achievement and tell how parents can help their child or children. This need was indicated by the opinions expressed on Statements Number Six and Seven.

The Vale School faculty should involve parents as much as possible in the planning of a new reporting system and report cards (suggestions on how to involve parents are included in Chapter II).

Before a new reporting system is put into use, the following points should be adequately communicated to all parents and teachers (suggestions for communicating a new system to parents and teachers are listed in Chapter II): First, the parents and teachers should have a basic understanding of the purposes of report cards. This need was indicated by the contradictions in opinions expressed on Statements Number One, Six, and Seven. Secondly, the parents and teachers should know exactly what the basis for evaluation will be. This need was indicated by the opinions expressed on Statement Number Nine. Thirdly, Statement Number Sixteen indicated that the parents did not realize the effects of traditional report cards on top students and low students. An effort should be made to inform the parents as to how the traditional reporting system helps the top students more than the low students. Also, the fact should be stressed that the new reporting system will be "fairer" to all students and that students will get a better understanding of their strong and weak points through the new system of reporting. This last need was indicated by the opinions expressed on Statement Number Eight. Fourthly, both parents and teachers should

be informed as to how important grades are to children, especially under the traditional system of reporting. Again, the fact should be emphasized that the new reporting system should eliminate some of the stress and importance of grades to children. This need was indicated by the opinions expressed on Statements Number Thirteen and Fourteen. Finally, the last point that needs to be communicated to the parents is that the marks on the traditional report card are not a true indication of future success in school and life. However, the point should be stressed that the new reporting system may be a better indication of future success. This need was indicated by the opinions expressed on Statement Number Twelve.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Aikens, Lewis R., Jr. "Rank in High School Graduating Classes of Various Sizes as a Prediction of College Grades," Journal of Educational Research, 58:56-60, October, 1964.
2. Alexander, Eugene D. "The Marking System and Poor Achievement," The Teacher's College Journal, 36:110-113, December, 1964.
3. Amsden, Robert L., and James S. Terwilliger. "Survey of Secondary School Marking Practices and Policies," National Association of Secondary School Principals' Bulletin, 50:1-37, March, 1966.
4. Anastasiow, Nicholas J. "Research and Development of an Elementary School Report Card," California Journal of Educational Research, 17:209-219, November, 1966.
5. Anderson, Edwin T. "An Analysis of Reporting to Parents of Secondary School Students." Unpublished Master's Thesis, Central Washington State College, August, 1957.
6. Anderson, Robert H. "Importance and Purposes of Reporting," National Elementary Principal, 45:6-11, May, 1966.
7. Austin, Mary C. "Report Cards and Parents," Reading Teacher, 18:660-663, May, 1965.
8. Bellevue Public Schools. "Teachers' Guide to Reporting Practices, Policies, and Procedures, Kindergarten Through Six," September, 1966. (Mimeographed.)
9. Bloom, Gerald. "There Should be No F's; Students Should be Judged on the Basis of Whether or Not They Are Achieving Their Potential," Business Education World, 46:13-14, March, 1966.
10. Boehm, Ann E., and Mary A. White. "Pupil's Perceptions of School Marks," Elementary School Journal, 67:237-240, February, 1967.
11. Bogdanovich, Louis R. "The Values of Parent-Teacher Conferences in the Raymond Schools," Unpublished Master's Thesis, Central Washington State College, August, 1958.

12. Brown, James W., Richard B. Lewis, and Fred F. Harclerod. Audio-Visual Instruction: Media and Methods. 3rd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1969.
13. Chadwick, Ruth E., and others. "Report Card in a Non-graded School," National Elementary Principal, 47:22-28, January, 1968.
14. Clark, Edward L. "Reliability of Grade Point Averages," Journal of Educational Research, 57:428-30, April, 1964.
15. Cutler, Marilyn H. "Does Your Report Card Format Rate an A?," Nation's Schools, 72:56-60+, September, 1963.
16. Doll, Ronald and Robert S. Fleming (eds.). Children Under Pressure: A Collection of Readings About Scholastic Pressure. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Books, Inc., 1966.
17. Drews, Elizabeth. "Evaluation of Achievement," Instructor, 75:20+, April, 1966.
18. Esbensen, Thorwald. Working With Individualized Instruction: The Duluth Experience. Palo Alto, California: Fearon Publishers, 1968.
19. Frenkel, Harriet. "Individualized Report Cards," Instructor, 75:38, September, 1965.
20. Frey, Sherman H., and Shinkiehi Shimabukuro. "Programmed Instruction: Implications for Change," Clearing House, 39:242-6, December, 1964.
21. Friese, John F. "Individualized Education for Every Child," Education, 84:546-50, May, 1964.
22. Goodlad, John I. "Directions of Curriculum Change," National Education Association Journal, 55:33-37, December, 1966.
23. Halliwell, Joseph W. "Parental Interpretation of and Reaction to Dual Report Cards," Clearing House, 36:245-247, December, 1961.
24. Halliwell, Joseph W., and Joseph P. Robitaille. "The Relationship between Theory and Practice in a Dual Reporting Program," Journal of Educational Research, 57:137-141, November, 1963.

25. Hammel, John A. "Report Cards: A Rationale," National Elementary Principal, 43:50-52, May, 1964.
26. Hockstad, Patricia. "Report Cards--Helpful or Harmful," Education, 84:174-175, November, 1963.
27. Houghie, Betty. "Farmer Brown's School: What to Report: Satire," National Elementary Principal, 45:12-16, May, 1966.
28. Hoyt, Donald P. "The Relationship Between College Grades and Adult Achievement," Phi Delta Kappan, 47:275, January, 1966.
29. Kingston, Albert J., and James A. Wash. "Research on Reporting Systems," National Elementary Principal, 45:36-40, May, 1966.
30. Klemm, Eugene. "Parents and Report Cards," P.T.A. Magazine, 61:24-26, October, 1966.
31. Lange, Phil C. "Taking the Stress off Grades," P.T.A. Magazine, 62:19-21, October, 1967.
32. Lindquist, E. F. "Evaluation of a Technique for Scaling High School Grades to Improve Prediction of College Success," Educational and Psychological Measurement, 23:623-46, Winter, 1963.
33. Link, Francis R. "To Grade or Not To Grade," P.T.A. Magazine, 62:10-12, November, 1967.
34. Long Beach Unified School District, Office of Curriculum Development, Division of Instruction. "Manual for Preparing the Elementary Progress Report," 1966.
35. Mahler, Fred L., and A. M. Fox. "Marking Practices; Study of 139 School Districts in Texas," Texas Outlet, 51:22-23, April, 1967.
36. Matlin, Arnold H., and Francis A. Mendelshon. "The Relationship Between Personality and Achievement Variables in the Elementary School," Journal of Educational Research, 58:457-59, June-August, 1965.
37. May, Ronald M. "Traditional Marking: Is it Detrimental to Children?" Unpublished Special Problem Paper, Washington State University, 1967.

38. Mikaelian, Sam, and Ronald B. Thompson. "Evanston Tried Computer Report Cards," Instructor, 77:129, March, 1968.
39. Misner, Paul J. "The Restoration of Report Cards--A Report on Reporting," P.T.A. Magazine, 58:10-12, February, 1964.
40. Munden, John. "It's Vicious, Undemocratic, Immoral," Washington Education Association Journal, 79:11-12, May, 1968.
41. National Education Association Research Division. "Reports to Parents," N.E.A. Research Bulletin, 45:51-53, May, 1967.
42. Neff, Neal. "Mark of Failure," School and Community, 52:24, September, 1965.
43. Pemberton, John H. "Rx for Report Card Blues," Clearing House, 36:75-77, October, 1961.
44. Phelps, H. Vaughn. "How to Design a Report Card Parents Can Understand," School Management, 8:72-74, May, 1964.
45. Richardson, Sybil. "Reporting to Parents," Instructor, 69:9, June, 1960.
46. Roth, Lois. "Evaluation and the Psychological Needs of Children," A speech delivered October 18, 1968, at a WESPA Workshop, "Project Awareness," at Central Washington State College.
47. Rothney, John W. M. Evaluating and Reporting Pupil Progress. Department of Classroom Teachers and American Educational Research Association of the National Education Association, 1955.
48. Schinbeckler, Harmon L. "The Use of Parent Conferences as a Means of Reporting and Guiding Pupil Progress in the Elementary School." Unpublished Master's Thesis, Central Washington State College, 1952.
49. Slocomb, Don B. "All Teachers Grade Alike," Texas Outlet, 49:20-21+, June, 1965.
50. Sternig, John. "New Progressive Education?", Educational Leadership, 21:498-500, May, 1964.

51. Theriault, Jan Jerry. "An Evaluation of the Intermediate Progress Report of the Wenatchee Schools." Unpublished Master's Thesis, Central Washington State College, 1967.
52. Washington Elementary School Principals' Association. "Resolution on Comparative Grading," adopted October, 1967. Washington Education Association Journal, 79:12, May, 1968.
53. White, Mary Alice, and Ann E. Boehm. "Child's World of Marks," National Education Association Journal, 57:12-13, January, 1968.
54. Yauch, Wilbur A. "School Marks and Their Reporting," National Education Association Journal, 50:50+, May, 1961.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

PARENTS' QUESTIONNAIRE

Rate each of the following statements as to whether you

(1) Strongly Agree; (2) Agree; (3) Have No Opinion; (4) Disagree; (5) Strongly Disagree.

- | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. The report card tells you what you want to know about your child or children's growth and progress. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. The language used on the report card is easy to understand. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3. The present system of reporting four times a year is sufficient to keep you informed of your child or children's growth and progress. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4. There is too much information on the report card. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5. The report card provides adequate two-way communication between school and home and home and school. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 6. The report card shows reasons for unsatisfactory growth or lack of achievement. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 7. The report card tells what you can do to help your child. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 8. Your child or children gain understanding of their strong and weak points from the report card. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 9. The report card clearly shows the basis for evaluation. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 10. Your child or children should be evaluated in terms of how they compare with their classmates in each subject. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 11. Your child or children should be evaluated in terms of their own ability in each subject. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

12. The marks on the report card are a good indication of your child or children's future success in school and life. 1 2 3 4 5
13. The report card tends to promote excessive competition among children. 1 2 3 4 5
14. The report card causes children to work for good grades rather than to develop the ability to use knowledge effectively. 1 2 3 4 5
15. A certain number of children in each class should receive "failing" marks on their report cards. 1 2 3 4 5
16. The top students benefit more from report cards than do the lower students. 1 2 3 4 5
17. In general, how did your child or children do on today's report card? (Circle one)

ABOVE AVERAGE

AVERAGE

BELOW AVERAGE

18. Use the back of this paper to write any comments, questions, suggestions, or criticisms about the report card or this survey.

APPENDIX B

TEACHERS' QUESTIONNAIRE

Rate each of the following statements as to whether you

(1) Strongly Agree; (2) Agree; (3) Have No Opinion; (4) Dis-
agree; (5) Strongly Disagree.

1. The language used on the report card is easy to understand. 1 2 3 4 5
2. The present system of reporting four times a year is sufficient to keep parents informed of their child or children's growth and progress. 1 2 3 4 5
3. There is too much information on the report card. 1 2 3 4 5
4. The report card provides adequate two-way communication between school and home and home and school. 1 2 3 4 5
5. The report card shows reasons for unsatisfactory growth or lack of achievement. 1 2 3 4 5
6. The report card tells parents what they can do to help their child. 1 2 3 4 5
7. Children gain understanding of their strong and weak points from the report card. 1 2 3 4 5
8. The report card clearly shows the basis for evaluation. 1 2 3 4 5
9. Children should be evaluated in terms of how they compare with their classmates in each subject. 1 2 3 4 5
10. Children should be evaluated in terms of their own ability in each subject. 1 2 3 4 5
11. The marks on the report card are a good indication of children's future success in school and life. 1 2 3 4 5

12. The report card tends to promote excessive competition among children. 1 2 3 4 5
13. The report card causes children to work for good grades rather than to develop the ability to use knowledge effectively. 1 2 3 4 5
14. A certain number of children in each class should receive "failing" marks on their report cards. 1 2 3 4 5
15. The top students benefit more from report cards than do the lower students. 1 2 3 4 5
16. Use the back of this paper to write any comments, questions, suggestions, or criticisms about the report card or this survey.

APPENDIX C

LETTER TO PARENTS

January 22, 1969

Dear Parents:

The teachers at the Vale Elementary School are interested in soliciting your opinions regarding the report card that your child brings home and your opinions regarding "reporting" in general. We recognize that the essential purpose of report cards and "reporting" is to inform parents about their child's progress and growth in all aspects of the school program. In order for use to find out if our report card is communicating what you want to know, we would like to ask if you would participate in a study to help us evaluate our reporting procedures.

The questionnaire on the following page, when completed, should be returned with your child's report card to his or her teacher. There is no need to sign your name. If you have more than one child in the Vale Elementary School, please fill out and return only one questionnaire.

The results of this survey will be announced at a future P.T.A. meeting. Thank you for your assistance in this matter which is of importance in reporting your child's school progress.

Sincerely,

Conrad Lautensleger, Principal
Vale Elementary School

CASHMERE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Cashmere, Washington

Report of Pupil's Progress

Grades 1, 2, and 3

Name of Pupil _____

Grade _____ School _____ Year 19____ 19____

_____ Teacher

_____ Principal

As one means of communication between school and home, this pupil report is being submitted to you. It represents the best judgment of the teacher in appraising the progress of your child in school. It is designed to furnish you with information concerning your child's progress in studies and character development, in order that home and school may cooperate in his or her education.

As no one reporting method can give you the whole picture of your child's growth and development, this report will, therefore, have its greatest value in connection with Parent-Teacher conferences.

Richard Johnson, Superintendent

Cashmere Public Schools

READING

1 2 3 4

- | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Word Attack Skills (phonics, context clues, structural analysis). _____ | | | | |
| 2. Comprehension (read for meaning). _____ | | | | |
| 3. Oral Reading. _____ | | | | |
| 4. Reading Habits (eye movements, non-use of finger and lips, substitution and omission of words). _____ | | | | |
| 5. Mastering New Words. _____ | | | | |
| 6. _____ | | | | |

LANGUAGE

- | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Gains in Understanding grammar and punctuation. _____ | | | | |
| 2. Expresses thoughts well (orally). _____ | | | | |
| 3. Expresses thoughts well (written). _____ | | | | |
| 4. _____ | | | | |

PENMANSHIP

- | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Tries to do neat work. _____ | | | | |
| 2. Forms letters carefully and correctly. _____ | | | | |
| 3. Shows growth in muscular coordination. _____ | | | | |
| 4. _____ | | | | |

SPELLING

- | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Spelling lessons (learning new words). _____ | | | | |
| 2. Applies spelling skills to other areas. _____ | | | | |
| 3. _____ | | | | |

MATHEMATICS

- | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Knows basic processes. _____ | | | | |
| 2. Solves problems through reasoning. _____ | | | | |
| 3. Works with accuracy. _____ | | | | |
| 4. Understands the use of numbers. _____ | | | | |
| 5. _____ | | | | |

SOCIAL STUDIES

- | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Retains and applies learnings. _____ | | | | |
| 2. Contributions by way of experiences and materials brought to the group. _____ | | | | |
| 3. _____ | | | | |

HEALTH and P.E.

1 2 3 4

- | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Practices good health habits. _____ | | | | |
| 2. Mastery of skills taught. _____ | | | | |
| 3. _____ | | | | |

SCIENCE

- | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Retains and applies learnings. _____ | | | | |
| 2. Contributions by way of experiences and materials brought to the group. _____ | | | | |
| 3. _____ | | | | |

ART

- | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|----------|---|---|---|---|
| 1. _____ | | | | |
| 2. _____ | | | | |

MUSIC

- | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|----------|---|---|---|---|
| 1. _____ | | | | |
| 2. _____ | | | | |

SOCIAL ADJUSTMENTS

- | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Practices good citizenship. _____ | | | | |
| 2. Shows Initiative. _____ | | | | |
| 3. Is friendly and cheerful. _____ | | | | |

STUDY HABITS

- | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Makes good of time. _____ | | | | |
| 2. Listens to, and follows, instructions. _____ | | | | |
| 3. Works independently. _____ | | | | |
| 4. Works well in group activities. _____ | | | | |
| 5. Participates in class discussions. _____ | | | | |
| 6. Works up to ability. _____ | | | | |

-|+ indicates above average

✓ indicates average

— indicates need for improvement

APPENDIX E

CASHMERE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

CASHMERE, WASHINGTON

Report of Pupil's Progress

Grades 4 - 5

Name _____

Teacher _____

Grade _____ Year _____

_____, Principal

Dear Parents:

As one means of communication between school and home, this pupil report is being submitted to you. It represents the best judgment of the teacher in appraising the progress of your child in school. It is designed to furnish you with information concerning your child's progress in studies and character development, in order that home and school may cooperate in his or her education.

In keeping with the constant objective of helping each child develop to his full potential, this report will evaluate the pupil in two ways: one is achievement in terms of grade level standards, the other in terms of his effort.

As no one reporting method can give you the whole picture of your child's growth and development, this report will, therefore, have its greatest value in connection with Parent-Teacher conferences.

Cashmere Public Schools

Explanation of Achievement Marks

When a student gets a grade of "A" he:

1. Completes assignments and does an excellent job.
2. Completes work on time.
3. Consistently exceeds the requirements of the grade.

When a student gets a grade of "B" he:

1. Completes assignments and does a good job.
2. Completes work on time.
3. Usually exceeds the requirements of his grade.

When a student gets a grade of "C" he:

1. Completes his work with average success.
2. Occasionally requires additional time.
3. Meets the requirements of his grade.

When a student gets a grade of "D" he:

1. Usually does not complete the assignment.
2. Usually does not turn work in on time.
3. Does not meet the requirements of his grade.

When a student gets a grade of "F" he:

1. Does not complete assignments.
2. Seldom turns in any work.
3. Shows little interest in achievement.

Explanation of Effort Marks

1. Consistently puts forth good effort.
2. Adequate effort.
3. Seldom puts forth enough effort.

Explanation of Sub-heading Marks

Plus If above average
Check If average
Minus If below average

A E A E S A E A E S

READING

1. Word attack skills - Phonics _____
2. Reads with understanding _____
3. Oral reading _____

LANGUAGE

1. Gains in understanding grammar and punctuation _____
2. Expresses thoughts well (orally) _____
3. Expresses thoughts well (written) _____

SCIENCE

1. Learns factual material _____
2. Applies concepts learned _____

MATH

1. Knows basic processes _____
2. Solves problems through reasoning _____
3. Works with accuracy _____

SOCIAL STUDIES

1. Retains and uses facts _____
2. Can use maps, charts and other reference materials _____

HEALTH & P. E.

1. Mastery of skills taught _____
2. Health habits _____

ART

1. Shows originality _____
2. Does neat work _____

A E A E S A E A E S

MUSIC OR BAND

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____

SPELLING

1. Formal lessons _____
2. Applies spelling skills to other areas _____

SOCIAL ADJUSTMENT

1. Is courteous and considerate _____
2. Holds to school and room standards _____
3. Is careful of personal and public property _____
4. Accepts direction well _____

STUDY HABITS

1. Makes good use of time _____
2. Listens to, and follows, instructions _____
3. Works independently _____
4. Completes work on time _____
5. Works well in group activities _____
6. Participates in class discussions _____
7. Strives for neatness and legibility _____

Comments:

END-OF-YEAR SUMMARY

Health Record

Date _____ Height _____ Weight _____

Date _____ Height _____ Weight _____

Attendance Record

Days Present _____

Days Absent _____

Times Tardy _____

Signature of Parent:

1st Reporting Period _____

2nd Reporting Period _____

3rd Reporting Period _____

Assigned to Grade _____

Date _____

Teacher's Signature _____

APPENDIX F

NUMBER OF PARENTS' RESPONSES ON EACH STATEMENT:
FIVE CHOICES

Statements	Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1	21	127	2	31	7
2	33	142	4	14	1
3	25	130	2	27	8
4	3	4	7	115	63
5	8	82	15	69	15
6	6	53	12	92	23
7	7	45	10	91	33
8	19	95	14	52	9
9	6	88	27	60	6
10	7	32	21	76	51
11	70	97	7	17	0
12	4	70	25	72	17
13	8	44	38	90	11
14	14	42	49	68	11
15	2	2	26	58	104
16	9	29	20	92	42

APPENDIX G

NUMBER OF TEACHERS' RESPONSES ON EACH STATEMENT:
FIVE CHOICES

Statements	Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1	Teachers did not respond to this statement				
2	2	10	1	2	0
3	4	6	0	2	3
4	2	1	0	7	5
5	0	2	0	7	6
6	0	1	0	5	9
7	0	0	0	6	9
8	0	4	0	6	5
9	0	4	0	5	6
10	0	1	1	4	8
11	10	2	0	2	0
12	0	2	0	6	7
13	2	6	2	4	1
14	6	4	1	4	0
15	0	0	0	5	10
16	6	8	0	1	0

APPENDIX H

NUMBER OF PARENTS' RESPONSES ON EACH STATEMENT:
THREE CHOICES

State- ment	Agree	Dis- agree	No Opinion	State- ment	Agree	Dis- agree	No Opinion
1	148	38	2	9	94	66	27
2	175	15	4	10	39	127	21
3	155	35	2	11	167	17	7
4	7	178	7	12	74	89	25
5	90	84	15	13	52	101	38
6	59	115	12	14	58	79	49
7	52	124	10	15	4	162	26
8	114	60	14	16	38	133	20

APPENDIX I

NUMBER OF TEACHERS' RESPONSES ON EACH STATEMENT:
THREE CHOICES

State- ment	Agree	Dis- agree	No Opinion	State- ment	Agree	Dis- agree	No Opinion
1	Teachers did not respond			9	4	11	0
2	12	2	1	10	1	12	1
3	10	5	0	11	12	2	0
4	3	12	0	12	2	13	0
5	2	13	0	13	8	5	2
6	1	14	0	14	10	4	1
7	0	15	0	15	0	15	0
8	4	11	0	16	14	1	0

APPENDIX J

COMPARISON IN PERCENTAGES OF PARENTS' AND TEACHERS' RESPONSES ON EACH STATEMENT:
THREE CHOICES

Statement	Agree		Disagree		No Opinion	
	Parents	Teachers	Parents	Teachers	Parents	Teachers
1	79	--	20	--	1	--
2	90	80	8	13	2	7
3	81	67	18	33	1	0
4	4	20	93	80	4	0
5	48	13	44	87	8	0
6	32	7	62	93	6	0
7	28	0	67	100	5	0
8	61	27	32	73	7	0
9	50	27	35	73	14	0
10	21	7	68	86	11	7
11	87	86	9	14	4	0
12	39	13	47	87	13	0
13	27	53	53	33	20	13
14	31	67	42	27	26	7
15	2	0	84	100	14	0
16	20	93	70	7	10	0

CENTRAL WASHINGTON STATE COLLEGE

Graduate Division

Final Examination of

David L. Lentz

B. A., Central Washington State College

1967

for the degree of

Master of Education

Committee in Charge

Dr. Bill Gaskell

Dr. John Davis Dr. Dan Unruh

Student Union Building

North Paw

Thursday, July 24, 1969

11:00 a.m.

Courses Included in Graduate Study

Required Courses

Education	507	Introduction to Graduate Study
Education	570	Educational Foundations
Education	600	Thesis
Psychology	552	Human Growth & Development, Advanced

Courses in Field of Specialization

Art	430	Art in the Elementary School
Education	427	Modern Arithmetic Program, Primary
Education	447	Classroom Teaching Problems
Education	459x	Teacher Counseling
Education	547x	Supervision of Student Teachers
Education	555x	Program of Curriculum Improvement
P. E.	334	P. E. Activities for the Elementary School

Elective Courses

History	391	The South American Republics
Music	354B	Class Voice
Philosophy	480	Philosophy of Science
Sociology	470	Contemporary Social Thought

BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION

Born: [REDACTED]

Undergraduate Study:

Grays Harbor College, two years, 1963-1965.
University of Washington, one summer, 1966.
Central Washington State College, two years, 1965-1967.

Professional Experience:

Teacher's Aid: Yakima Valley School, Selah, Washington,
summer, 1967.

Teacher: Vale Elementary School, Cashmere,
Washington, 1967-1969.

Certification:

Provisional Certificate, now being converted to the
Standard Certificate.