



SYMPOSIUM EVALUATION REPORT

PREPARED FOR:

NEGLECTED AND DELINQUENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

PREPARED BY:

EDUCATIONAL ENTERPRISES, LLC



JANUARY 2007

Table of Contents

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
<i>Introduction</i>	2
<i>Conference Evaluation Summary</i>	3
<i>Session Evaluation Summary</i>	3
<i>Conclusions</i>	7
<i>Appendix A: Evaluation Forms</i>	8
<i>Appendix B: Conference Evaluation</i>	11
<i>Appendix C: Session Evaluations</i>	16
All You Need to Know About Accessing Your Federal Funds	17
An Update on No Child Left Behind	23
Congratulations! You've Completed Your Program, Now What?	29
2006 IDEA 04 Update	32
Integrating Guided Reading into Your Education Program	35
Motivation Through the Outdoor Classroom	38
N & D Title I On-Line Reporting	41
Practical Implementation of a Circle Process	44
Pre-Voc: A Passport to Professionalism	47
Relevant, Ready, Reliable: User/Student Friendly Assessments	50
Title I & the Monitoring Instrument	53
To Mentor or Not to Mentor, Who Really Learns?	56
Youthwork in Action	59

Neglected and Delinquent Leadership Symposium

Evaluation Report

Introduction

The Fourth Annual Neglected and Delinquent Leadership Symposium was held at the Seven Springs Resort in Champion, Pennsylvania from November 7 - 9, 2006. The general intent of the symposium was to support the distinct goals established by the N & D Advisory Committee, which are to:

- Update and assist agencies and LEA's in monitoring, assessment and reporting requirements for Title I programs;
- Provide technical assistance and support to agencies in Pennsylvania;
- Plan the N & D program strands for the annual Federal Programs Coordinators Conference; and
- Provide feedback and guidance to USDE and PDE in preparation for reauthorization.

More specifically, one manifest theme or focus of the leadership symposium was directed toward the impact of the No Child Left Behind legislation on Pennsylvania's neglected children. To address both the broad and particular goals of the symposium, both general sessions and breakout sessions were utilized as strategies for providing participants with current information as well as providing a forum for interaction with other professionals in the field.

The opening general session of the symposium consisted of remarks from Ed Dutton, Pennsylvania Department of Education and Greg Martin, President of Pennsylvania Association of Federal Program Coordinators. The closing general session featured a presentation by Ms. Joyce Burrell and her staff; Joyce is Project Director for The National Evaluation and Technical Assistance Center for the Education of Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk. The breakout session topics included: highly qualified staff mandates, updates on NCLB, progress monitoring, an overview of alternative education, an IDEA update, accessing Federal funds, unique Title I programs, and an overview of the Youthwork program.

With the general intent of the symposium being to bring together personnel from N & D agencies across the state to further their understanding of Title I and to provide assistance in program enhancement, the target audience for the symposium naturally included administrators and personnel delivering Title I services in N & D institutions. The participants included staff from N & D institutions, and these were a combination of

administrators and program personnel, staff members representing LEA's, staff from PDE, and consultants. In terms of the breakout sessions and general sessions that occurred during the symposium, leadership was provided by PDE staff (2), Intermediate Unit personnel (5), LEA staff (4), consultants (9), and monitors for N & D Title I programs (1).

The evaluation was comprised of two complimentary components. The first approach addressed the overall symposium and participant's more global perceptions of the value and utility of conference proceedings. The intent of this evaluative activity was to determine the kinds of topics that should be addressed and the ways in which future symposium could be improved. The evaluation also examined each of the individual sessions. The focus of this activity was to gauge the impact of the session and to provide evaluative feedback to the session presenters. Copies of the Conference Evaluation Form and Session Evaluation Form may be found in Appendix A.

Participants of the N & D symposium were asked to indicate their opinions on various aspects of the conference as well as each breakout session. A rating scale of 1 to 3 was used, where 1= poor, 2= satisfactory, and 3= excellent. Participants were also asked to comment on the most useful aspects of the symposium/breakout session, the things they would change to improve the symposium/breakout session, what topics need to be addressed at future symposia, as well as and what was learned and how they intend to use their newly acquired knowledge from the session in their professional activities.

Conference Evaluation

Forty-five participants completed a conference evaluation for this symposium. A larger number of the respondents were administrators or teachers from state institutions or neglected or delinquent programs. The mean scores ranged from 2.89 (the usefulness of the materials provided and the overall quality of the symposium) to 3.00 (the overall organization of the conference), this indicates an 'excellent' overall satisfaction level with the conference, and that the N & D conference continues to be a success.

Overall, symposium participants enjoyed the opportunity to engage in meaningful dialogue with N & D peers as well as PDE personnel. In general, respondents found "workshops and opportunities to meet and share information with other N & D program representatives and peers" to be the most useful aspect of the symposium. However, respondents indicated improvements could be made to the symposium by "having fewer and longer sessions instead of many short sessions." Respondents indicated that future topics for the symposium should include "legal updates and the review of the responsibilities of N & D programs."

Session Evaluations

Thirty participants completed an evaluation for the breakout session, **All You Need to Know About Accessing Your Federal Funds – Session 1**. Mean scores ranged from 2.40 (the quality of the materials provided) to 2.93 (the presenter's understanding of

program content.) indicating a ‘good to ‘excellent’ level of satisfaction with the session. The materials were adequate and useful. The Title I “Guidance” booklet was considered the most useful aspect of this session. No recommendations for improvement were listed for this session. Respondents felt that the session was well planned, and they plan to download and share the “Guidance” booklet with fellow colleagues.

Twenty-two participants completed an evaluation for the breakout session, **All You Need to Know About Accessing Your Federal Funds – Session 2**. Mean scores ranged from 2.59 (the presenters’ ability to actively engage you) to 2.86 (the presenter's understanding of program content.) indicating an ‘excellent’ level of satisfaction with the session. The materials were adequate and useful. The Title I update was considered the most useful aspect of this session. The only recommendation for improvement in this session was to provide more guidance while going through the handout. Respondents felt that the session was well planned, and they plan to share the information about the use of Title I funds with administrators at their institutions.

Twenty-six participants completed an evaluation for the breakout session, **An Update on No Child Left Behind – Session 1**. Mean scores ranged from 2.61 (the utility of materials provided.) to 2.92 (the presenter’s ability to convey program content and the overall session information presented) indicating an ‘excellent’ level of satisfaction with this aspect of the symposium. Respondents indicated the materials and handouts were adequate. The clarification of NCLB, the PSSA, and the differential definition on highly qualified staff were deemed the most useful aspects of the session. The lone recommendation for improvement in this session was to provide a handout of the PowerPoint presentation. Respondents felt that they gained a great deal of knowledge pertaining to highly qualified staff and the NCLB update in general.

Thirty-two participants completed an evaluation for the breakout session, **An Update on No Child Left Behind – Session 2**. Mean scores ranged from 2.63 (the quality of materials provided.) to 2.92 (the presenter’s ability to convey program content) indicating an ‘excellent’ level of satisfaction with this session. Respondents indicated the materials and handouts were adequate. The clarification of NCLB, the PSSA, and the differential definition on highly qualified staff were deemed the most useful aspects of the session. The lone recommendation for improvement in this session included: providing a handout of the PowerPoint presentation. Respondents felt that they gained a great deal of knowledge pertaining to highly qualified staff and the NCLB update in general.

Eleven participants completed an evaluation for the breakout session, **Congratulations! You’ve Completed Your Program, Now What?** Mean scores ranged from 2.64 (the utility of the materials provided) to 3.00 (the presenter’s approach to convey the program content.) indicating an ‘excellent’ level of satisfaction with the session. Respondents noted that the materials were excellent. Respondents indicated that the information regarding alternative education programs was considered the most useful aspect of this event. Respondents felt that the session could be improved by making the session longer. Respondents felt that the session was well planned, and they plan to share the information with staff at their N & D institution.

Eighteen participants completed an evaluation for the breakout session, **2006 IDEA Update**. Mean scores ranged from 2.72 (the utility of materials provided) to 2.83 (the presenters' approach to convey program content) indicating an 'excellent' level of satisfaction with the session. Respondents indicated that the materials were excellent. The general update and information pertaining to IEP's were the most useful aspects of the session. The recommendation for improvement in this session centered on providing even more detail about IEP's. Respondents indicated that they would share the update information with teachers and staff.

Seventeen participants completed an evaluation for the breakout session, **Integrating Guided Reading into Your Education Program**. Mean scores ranged from 2.71 (the utility of the materials provided) 2.88 (the presenter's ability to convey the program content.) indicating an 'excellent' level of satisfaction with the session. Respondents noted that the materials were excellent. All of the information on starting and utilizing a Guided Reading program was considered the most useful aspect of this event. The only recommendation for improvement in this session was to make the session less lecture like and more interactive. Respondents felt that the session was well planned, and indicated that they would investigate the visibility of implementing a Guided Reading Program at their institution.

Eighteen participants completed an evaluation for the breakout session, **Motivation Through the Outdoor Classroom**. Mean scores ranged from 2.83 (the presenters' ability to engage the participants and the utility and quality of the materials provided) 3.00 (the presenter's ability to convey the program content.) indicating an 'excellent' level of satisfaction with the session. Respondents indicated that the materials were excellent. Seeing the creative way funds can be utilized was considered the most useful aspects of this event. Recommendations for session improvement centered on having more pictures of the created trails. Respondents indicated the session inspired them to find more inventive ways to educate their students.

Eighteen participants completed an evaluation for the breakout session, **N & D Title I On-line Reporting**. Mean scores were all 3.00 indicating an 'excellent' level of satisfaction with this aspect of the symposium. Respondents noted the materials were great and will be shared with colleagues at their facility. Having the general update for next year's reporting was considered the most useful aspects of this event. No suggested improvements were reported for this session. Respondents indicated that would make changes to this year's form, when they return to their institution.

Eleven participants completed an evaluation for the breakout session, **Practical Implementation of a Circle Process**. Mean scores ranged from 2.55 (the utility and quality of the materials provided.) to 3.00 (the presenters' ability to convey the program content), indicating an 'excellent' level of satisfaction with this session. Respondents indicated the Circle Process itself was considered the most useful aspects of this event. The main recommendation for improvement in this session was to provide samples and

demonstration of the circle process. Respondents indicated that they would use the process at their institution.

Eighteen participants completed an evaluation for the breakout session, **Pre-Voc: A Passport to Professionalism**. Mean scores ranged from 2.78 (the utility of the materials.) to 2.83 (all other aspects of the session) indicating an ‘excellent’ level of satisfaction with this aspect of the symposium. Respondents noted the materials were great and will be shared with colleagues at their facility. Respondents indicated the learning modules were considered the most useful aspects of this event. The main recommendation for improvement in this session was to provide a sufficient number of handouts. Respondents indicated that they would share the information with colleagues at their institution.

Twenty-seven participants completed an evaluation for the breakout session, **Relevant, Ready, Reliable: User/Student Friendly Assessments**. Mean scores ranged from 2.85 (the utility of the materials provided) to 2.93 (the presenter’s approach to convey the program content, the quality of the materials provided, and the overall organization of the session) indicating an ‘excellent’ level of satisfaction with the session. The knowledge of the presenters’ considered the most useful aspect of this event. The only recommendation for improvement in this session was for the presenters to refrain from simply from reading off the PowerPoint document. Respondents indicated that they will share the information from this session with the teachers at their institutions.

Twenty-six participants completed an evaluation for the breakout session, **Title I & the Monitoring Instrument**. Mean scores ranged from 2.73 (the quality of the materials provided) to 3.00 (the presenter’s approach to convey the program content.) indicating an ‘excellent’ level of satisfaction with this aspect of the conference. Respondents indicated that materials presented in the session were excellent. Respondents noted that the use of the monitoring instrument and learning about the responsibilities of the LEA’s were the most useful aspects of this event. The main recommendations for improvement in this session was add additional information (i.e., more detailed hands-on explanations) to the handouts. Respondents indicated that they would present the information learned from the session to colleagues at their institution.

Twenty-five participants completed an evaluation for the breakout session, **To Mentor or Not to Mentor, Who Really Learns?** Mean scores ranged from 2.72 (the quality of the materials provided) to 2.92 (the presenter’s approach to convey the program content.) indicating an ‘excellent’ level of satisfaction with this aspect of the conference. Respondents indicated that materials presented in the session were excellent. Respondents felt the overall program was the most useful aspects of this event. No recommendations were suggested for this session. Respondents indicated that they would present the information learned from the session to the supervisors at there institution, in hopes of starting their own program.

Eighteen participants completed an evaluation for the breakout session, **Youthwork in Action: Running an Alternative School for Disruptive Students as a Therapeutic**

Community. Mean scores ranged from 2.38 (the overall session information) to 2.67 (the presenter's approach to convey the program content.) indicating a 'good' to 'excellent' level of satisfaction with this aspect of the conference. Respondents indicated that materials presented in the session were useful. Respondents felt that learning about Youthworks was the most useful aspects of this event. Recommendations for the session included making it longer, but respondents felt that the session was very good.

Conclusions

The evaluation findings for the N & D Leadership Symposium corroborate the opinions expressed during the conference, where participants stated that the activities were very valuable in supporting the goals of N & D Advisory Committee. These goals include (1) assisting agencies and LEA's monitoring, assessment and reporting of requirements for Title I Programs; (2) providing technical assistance and support to agencies in Pennsylvania; and (3) providing feedback and guidance to USDE and PDE in preparation for reauthorization. In general terms, the symposium was a success; this success can be measured in the mean scores of the overall symposium content presented (2.85), and the usefulness of the symposium materials provided (2.75).

The symposium/breakout session evaluations not only provide feedback on the quality of the specific events, but also offer insight into the future needs of N & D clients. These evaluations provide continuous feedback to the Advisory Committee to ensure they are providing timely, adequate, and useful information to educators and administrators in Pennsylvania. The overall results provided in this report highlight respondent's high level of satisfaction with the N & D symposium/breakout sessions. Participants considered the N & D symposium to be comprised of high quality, meaningful, and informative learning sessions, which allowed them time to collaborate with colleagues and create a combination of useful and practical knowledge.

APPENDIX A

SYMPOSIUM AND SESSION EVALUATION FORMS

FOURTH ANNUAL N & D LEADERSHIP SYMPOSIUM

CONFERENCE EVALUATION FORM

We appreciate your feedback on the symposium. Please take a few moments to complete the following survey. Please return the survey to Joe Hiznay or Bill Evans prior to the conclusion of the symposium.

What is your current position?

___ Administrator ___ Teacher ___ Facility Staff ___ Other

In what type of program are you employed?

___ State Institution ___ Neglected ___ Delinquent ___ LEA

Based upon the following scale, please indicate your feelings regarding each of the following statements.

	Excellent	Satisfactory	Poor
The overall symposium content presented was:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Presenters' knowledge of program content was:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The usefulness of the materials provided was:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The overall organization of the symposium was:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Of the workshops you attended, which two did you feel were the most valuable? _____

Of the workshops you attended, which two did you feel were the least valuable? _____

What was the one most useful aspect of the conference? _____

What is one thing that could be done to improve the conference? _____

Please use the reverse side for additional space and comments. Thank you for your time.

FOURTH ANNUAL N & D LEADERSHIP SYMPOSIUM

SESSION EVALUATION FORM: *UPDATE ON NCLB*

We appreciate your feedback on this session. Please take a few moments to complete the following survey. Please return the survey to the session coordinator.

What is your current position?

___ Administrator ___ Teacher ___ Facility Staff ___ Other

In what type of program are you employed?

___ State Institution ___ Neglected ___ Delinquent ___ LEA

Based upon the following scale, please indicate your feelings regarding each of the following statements.

	Excellent	Satisfactory	Poor
The overall session information presented was:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Presenters' understanding of program content was:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Presenters' ability to actively engage you was:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The utility of the materials provided was:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The quality of the materials provided was:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The overall organization of the session was:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

What was most useful about the session? _____

How could we improve this session? _____

Please describe the most important thing you learned at this session, how you intend to use it in your professional activities, and how you will share it with others you did not attend the session. _____

Please use the reverse side for additional space and comments. Thank you for your time.

APPENDIX B

CONFERENCE EVALUATION

Neglected and Delinquent Leadership Symposium

Conference Evaluation

With the general intent of the symposium being to bring together personnel from neglect and delinquent (N & D) agencies from the state to further their understanding of Title I and to provide assistance in program enhancement, the target audience for the symposium naturally includes administrators and personnel delivering Title I services in N & D institutions. A total of 45 professionals completed a symposium evaluation form. The participants included 40 staff from neglect and/or delinquent institutions, and these were a combination of administrators and program personnel, eight staff members representing LEA's, and 11 staff members representing state institutions. In terms of the 16 breakout sessions and one general session that occurred during the symposium, leadership was provided by PDE staff (6), Intermediate Unit personnel (5), LEA staff (2), consultants (8), and monitors for N & D Title I programs (2).

Participants of the N & D symposium were asked to indicate their opinions on various aspects of the conference as well as, each breakout session. A rating scale of 1 to 3 was used, where 1= poor, 2= satisfactory, and 3= excellent. Participants were also asked to comment on the most useful aspects of the symposium/session, the things they could change to improve the symposium/session, what topics need to be addressed in future symposia, and what was learned, as well as the intended use of what was learned from the session.

Forty-five participants completed a conference evaluation for this symposium. A larger number of the respondents were administrators or teachers from state institutions or neglect or delinquent programs. The mean scores ranged from 2.75 (the usefulness of the materials provided) to 2.90 (presenter's knowledge of program content), this indicates an 'excellent' overall satisfaction level with the conference.

Neglected and Delinquent Leadership Symposium- Evaluations

October 26-28, 2005

(3=Excellent; 1=Poor)

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Mean
The overall program content presented was:	45	2.91
Presenters' knowledge of program content was:	45	2.91
The usefulness of the materials provided was	45	2.89
The overall organization of the conference was:	45	3.00
The overall relevance of the conference was:	45	2.93
The overall utility of the conference was:	45	2.91
The overall quality of the conference was:	45	2.89
Valid N (listwise)	45	

What is your current position?

	Frequency	Percent
Administrator	25	55.6
Teacher	17	37.8
Other	3	6.7
Total	45	100.0

Open Ended Comments: **These responses have not been edited for language usage, spelling, etc., and appear exactly as provided by the respondents.**

Of the workshops you attended, which two did you feel were the most valuable?

- IDEA Update - Not being sp. ed. certified, it was informative to know the update regs. Overview of the Juvenile Placements in PA
- Title I On-Line Reporting, Title I & the Monitoring Instrument
- Relevant, Ready, Reliable...Assessments, General Session
- On-Line Reporting, Update on NCLB
- Pre-Voc a Passport to Professionalism & NCLB Update
- NCLB & Title I Online Reporting

- Update on NCLB & Congratulations You've Completed Your Program Now What
- I felt that all of the workshops I attended were valuable.
- Youthwork in action - Running an alternative school Title
- NCLB & Title I & Mentoring Instrument
- NCLB & Accessing Funds
- Relevant, Ready, Reliable & Practice Implementation of a Circle Process
- Title I & the Monitoring Instrument
- Motivation Through the Outdoor Classroom & Youthwork in Action
- NCLB Update & Relevant, Ready, Reliable

Of the workshops you attended, which two did you feel were the least valuable?

- Therapeutic Community
- Not a fair question, because some of the sessions do not pertain to what I do.
- All workshops attended were valuable - some info. I had knowledge of, other info. provided clarification.
- Title I Monitoring, Juvenile Justice System
- Youthwork in Action, IDA o4
- Accessing Federal Funds & Youthwork in Action
- They were all adequate.
- Monitoring
- Day of the specific teaching workshops.
- I felt all workshops were well presented and had value
- Congratulations! You've Completed Your Program, Not What?

What was the one most useful aspect of the conference?

- Listening and sharing with fellow N & D staff experiences with our shared populations.
- On-Line Reporting
- Having all the N & D "Players" together in one place - sharing info.
- Contacts
- I enjoyed the presentation on " All You Need To Know About Accessing Your Fund"
- Able to talk with other programs.
- Transition
- The chance to meet other people who work in my field.
- Learning about Title I reporting, funding, etc. because I am a Title I instructor.
- Interacting with other people and getting ask questions to presenters.
- The knowledge of the presenters and the info. they provided.
- Great combination of offerings - info. geared to facilities, educators, monitoring help, & examples of how to use the funds effectively.
- The opportunity to meet other professional in the field and the learning of different programs
- Excellent overall.

What is one thing that could be done to improve the conference?

- More info. on the Reading and Math Assessments. Send info on next conference (mailing list)
- Facilities - HVAC in hotel rooms was not working.
- Perhaps having a workshop geared for people new to the N & D field.
- Too many speakers during meal times. It's hard to network and meet people when there are speakers during meals.
- More prominent speakers.
- The reservation forms could be written more clearly - choice of smoking/non-smoking. Also, letting us know of confirmation sooner.
- A longer break between last session and dinner.
- Workshops on classroom management

APPENDIX C

SESSION EVALUATIONS

All You Need to Know About Accessing Your Federal Funds – Session 1

Participants of the N & D symposium were asked to indicate their opinions on various aspects of each breakout session. A rating scale of 1 to 3 was used, where 1= poor, 2= satisfactory, and 3= excellent. Participants were also asked to comment on the most useful aspects of the session, the things they could change to improve the session, as well as what was learned from the session and how they intended to use their newly acquired knowledge in their professional activities.

Thirty participants completed an evaluation for the breakout session, **All You Need to Know About Accessing Your Federal Funds – Session 1**. Mean scores ranged from 2.40 (the quality of the materials provided) to 2.93 (the presenter's understanding of program content.) indicating a 'good to 'excellent' level of satisfaction with the session. The materials were adequate and useful. The Title I "Guidance" booklet was considered the most useful aspect of this session. No recommendations for improvement were listed for this session. Respondents felt that the session was well planned, and they plan to download and share the "Guidance" booklet with fellow colleagues.

All You Need to Know About Accessing Your Federal Funds – Session 1

Presented by: Mr. Ed Dutton

November 8, 2006

(3=Excellent; 1=Poor)

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Mean
The overall session information presented was:	30	2.67
Presenter's understanding of program content was:	30	2.93
Presenter's ability to actively engage you was:	30	2.50
The utility of the materials provided was:	30	2.43
The quality of the materials provided was:	30	2.40
The overall organization of the session was:	30	2.73
Valid N (listwise)	30	

What is your current position?

	Frequency	Percent
Administrator	15	50.0
Teacher	7	23.3
Facility Staff	3	10.0
Other	5	16.7
Total	30	100.0

In what type of program are you employed?

	Frequency	Percent
State Institution	11	36.7
Neglected	11	36.7
Delinquent	5	16.7
LEA	3	10.0
Total	30	100.0

Open Ended Comments: **These responses have not been edited for language usage, spelling, etc., and appear exactly as provided by the respondents.**

What was most useful about the session:

- General info. presented. Nice to meet the folks who are running the show.
- Learning how to secure the proper paperwork for funding and what an LEA is and how to use one.
- Information broken down into very understandable language.
- General explanation of education programs.
- Information regarding the Guidance booklet.
- Completing the PDE - 3048 by Dec. 10, 2006 to receive funding for next year. And finding out more about who my LEA is.

How could we improve this session:

- No improvements needed.

Information learned from session, future use for information:

- I intend to discuss the info. Learned with my supervisor, and determine allocation of funds and how we can help our low-level students to receive a better education.
- Intend to download website info on the Guidance. Will share with fellow workers.

All You Need to Know About Accessing Your Federal Funds – Session 2

Participants of the N & D symposium were asked to indicate their opinions on various aspects of each breakout session. A rating scale of 1 to 3 was used, where 1= poor, 2= satisfactory, and 3= excellent. Participants were also asked to comment on the most useful aspects of the session, the things they could change to improve the session, as well as what was learned from the session and how they intended to use their newly acquired knowledge in their professional activities.

Twenty-two participants completed an evaluation for the breakout session, **All You Need to Know About Accessing Your Federal Funds – Session 2**. Mean scores ranged from 2.59 (the presenters' ability to actively engage you) to 2.86 (the presenter's understanding of program content.) indicating an 'excellent' level of satisfaction with the session. The materials were adequate and useful. The Title I update was considered the most useful aspect of this session. The only recommendation for improvement in this session was to provide more guidance while going through the handout. Respondents felt that the session was well planned, and they plan to share the information about the use of Title I funds with administrators at their institutions.

All You Need to Know About Accessing Your Federal Funds – Session 2

Presented by: Mr. Ed Dutton

November 8, 2006

(3=Excellent; 1=Poor)

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Mean
The overall session information presented was:	22	2.72
Presenter's understanding of program content was:	22	2.86
Presenter's ability to actively engage you was:	22	2.59
The utility of the materials provided was:	22	2.72
The quality of the materials provided was:	22	2.69
The overall organization of the session was:	22	2.72
Valid N (listwise)	22	

What is your current position?

	Frequency	Percent
Administrator	15	68.2
Teacher	5	22.7
Facility Staff	1	4.5
Other	1	4.5
Total	22	100.0

In what type of program are you employed?

	Frequency	Percent
State Institution	5	22.7
Neglected	7	31.8
Delinquent	3	13.6
LEA	7	31.8
Total	22	100.0

Open Ended Comments: **These responses have not been edited for language usage, spelling, etc., and appear exactly as provided by the respondents.**

What was most useful about the session:

- Provided a general overview of what N & D's need to do.
- As an LEA I learned what N & D's need to do but it did not affect what I do.
- More in depth info.
- How to access information.
- Timelines!

How could we improve this session:

- Could have provided more guidance along with the handout.
- Less dependence on handout.

Information learned from session, future use for information:

- Downloaded the “Guidance” off the website to use as future reference.
- Website for the Guidance packet.
- Learning the process of how the funds are generated and where they come from.
- Can make recommendations to the institution of how the funds maybe allocated.

An Update on No Child Left Behind – Session 1

Participants of the N & D symposium were asked to indicate their opinions on various aspects of each breakout session. A rating scale of 1 to 3 was used, where 1= poor, 2= satisfactory, and 3= excellent. Participants were also asked to comment on the most useful aspects of the session, the things they could change to improve the session, as well as what was learned from the session and how they intended to use their newly acquired knowledge in their professional activities.

Twenty-six participants completed an evaluation for the breakout session, **An Update on No Child Left Behind – Session 1**. Mean scores ranged from 2.61 (the utility of materials provided.) to 2.92 (the presenter's ability to convey program content and the overall session information presented) indicating an 'excellent' level of satisfaction with this aspect of the symposium. Respondents indicated the materials and handouts were adequate. The clarification of NCLB, the PSSA, and the differential definition on highly qualified staff were deemed the most useful aspects of the session. The lone recommendation for improvement in this session included: providing a handout of the PowerPoint presentation. Respondents felt that they gained a great deal of knowledge pertaining to highly qualified staff and the NCLB update in general.

An Update on No Child Left Behind – Session 1

Presented by: Ms. Renee Palakovic

November 8, 2006

(3=Excellent; 1=Poor)

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Mean
The overall session information presented was:	26	2.92
Presenter's understanding of program content was:	26	2.92
Presenter's ability to actively engage you was:	26	2.77
The utility of the materials provided was:	26	2.61
The quality of the materials provided was:	26	2.73
The overall organization of the session was:	26	2.85
Valid N (listwise)	26	

What is your current position?

	Frequency	Percent
Administrator	12	46.2
Teacher	12	46.2
Facility Staff	1	3.8
Other	1	3.8
Total	26	100.0

In what type of program are you employed?

	Frequency	Percent
State Institution	6	23.1
Neglected	12	46.2
Delinquent	4	15.4
LEA	4	15.4
Total	26	100.0

Open Ended Comments: **These responses have not been edited for language usage, spelling, etc., and appear exactly as provided by the respondents.**

Most useful about the break-out session:

- Information regarding the program requirements and evaluation.
- Honestly, relating to politicians making decisions, not educators.
- Learning about the criteria for student's evaluation.
- Renee is so knowledgeable and she communicates this knowledge in a simple and effective manner.
- Distinction between Qualified staff vs. Highly Qualified Teachers.
- New info. on Title I and clarification on several issues.
- Breaking down the information to common language to make it understandable.
- Everything was helpful. I enjoyed hearing about all the information.
- New info. on Title I and clarification on several issues.
- Learning that all school students must accept any or all credits from our school.

Improvement of breakout session:

- Handout of presentation.
- Provide a handout.
- Longer Q & A session.

Information learned from session, future use for information:

- Share with LEA - who are ignorant.
- Distinction between Qualified staff vs. Highly Qualified Teachers.

An Update on No Child Left Behind – Session 2

Participants of the N & D symposium were asked to indicate their opinions on various aspects of each breakout session. A rating scale of 1 to 3 was used, where 1= poor, 2= satisfactory, and 3= excellent. Participants were also asked to comment on the most useful aspects of the session, the things they could change to improve the session, as well as what was learned from the session and how they intended to use their newly acquired knowledge in their professional activities.

Thirty-two participants completed an evaluation for the breakout session, **An Update on No Child Left Behind – Session 2**. Mean scores ranged from 2.63 (the quality of materials provided.) to 2.92 (the presenter's ability to convey program content) indicating an 'excellent' level of satisfaction with this aspect of the symposium. Respondents indicated the materials and handouts were adequate. The clarification of NCLB, the PSSA, and the differential definition on highly qualified staff were deemed the most useful aspects of the session. The lone recommendation for improvement in this session included: providing a handout of the PowerPoint presentation. Respondents felt that they gained a great deal of knowledge pertaining to highly qualified staff and the NCLB update in general.

An Update on No Child Left Behind – Session 2

Presented by: Ms. Renee Palakovic

November 8, 2006

(3=Excellent; 1=Poor)

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Mean
The overall session information presented was:	32	2.75
Presenter's understanding of program content was:	32	2.94
Presenter's ability to actively engage you was:	32	2.78
The utility of the materials provided was:	32	2.66
The quality of the materials provided was:	32	2.63
The overall organization of the session was:	32	2.84
Valid N (listwise)	32	

What is your current position?

	Frequency	Percent
Administrator	17	53.1
Teacher	10	31.3
Facility Staff	2	6.3
Other	3	9.4
Total	32	100.0

In what type of program are you employed?

	Frequency	Percent
State Institution	6	18.8
Neglected	16	50.0
Delinquent	6	18.8
LEA	4	12.5
Total	32	100.0

Open Ended Comments: **These responses have not been edited for language usage, spelling, etc., and appear exactly as provided by the respondents.**

Most useful about the break-out session:

- Providing the directions for Part A and Part B.
- The distinction between qualified and highly qualified. Also PSSA and PASA testing.
- The updates with new info.
- PSSA info.
- Being updated on changes from last year and having another overview of program.
- The descriptions of what all of the educational jargon and how it applies to me.
- The program evaluation process and how it relates to the reporting process.
- Clear understanding of program requirements and program evaluation.
- Info. on Highly Qualified vs. Qualified.
- The general overview is always good to hear as well as any changes that have occurred.
- Informative, Renee is very knowledgeable and understanding of difficulties faced by institutions attempting to educate neglected/delinquent students.
- Staying informed/update of how regs. are changing/impacting programming.

Improvement of breakout session:

- Handout of presentation.
- Provide a handout.
- Wouldn't change a thing. Good job!
- Better room conditions.
- More question/interaction/problem solving.

Information learned from session, future use for information:

- Review updates with our agency staff and evaluate areas of improvement.
- Provide in-house for my staff once I get info. off website.
- I will use some of the info. to improve our outcome internal reporting

Congratulations! You've Completed Your Program, Now What?

Participants of the N & D symposium were asked to indicate their opinions on various aspects of each breakout session. A rating scale of 1 to 3 was used, where 1= poor, 2= satisfactory, and 3= excellent. Participants were also asked to comment on the most useful aspects of the session, the things they could change to improve the session, as well as what was learned from the session and how they intended to use their newly acquired knowledge in their professional activities.

Eleven participants completed an evaluation for the breakout session, **Congratulations! You've Completed Your Program, Now What?** Mean scores ranged from 2.64 (the utility of the materials provided) to 3.00 (the presenter's approach to convey the program content.) indicating an 'excellent' level of satisfaction with the session. Respondents suggested the materials were excellent. Respondents indicated that the information regarding alternative education programs was considered the most useful aspect of this event. Respondents felt that the session could be improved by making the session longer. Respondents felt that the session was well planned, and they plan to share the information with staff at their N & D institution.

Congratulations! You've Completed Your Program, Now What?

Presented by: Ms. Rebecca Nudelman, Ms. Kathy Goodwin, Mr. Louis Bozelli

November 8, 2006

(3=Excellent; 1=Poor)

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Mean
The overall session information presented was:	11	2.82
Presenter's understanding of program content was:	11	3.00
Presenter's ability to actively engage you was:	11	2.73
The utility of the materials provided was:	11	2.64
The quality of the materials provided was:	11	2.73
The overall organization of the session was:	11	2.73
Valid N (listwise)	11	

What is your current position?

	Frequency	Percent
Administrator	5	45.5
Teacher	2	18.2
Facility Staff	1	9.1
Other	3	27.3
Total	11	100.0

In what type of program are you employed?

	Frequency	Percent
State Institution	3	27.3
Neglected	5	45.5
Delinquent	2	18.2
LEA	1	9.1
Total	11	100.0

Open Ended Comments: **These responses have not been edited for language usage, spelling, etc., and appear exactly as provided by the respondents.**

Most useful about the break-out session:

-

Improvement of breakout session:

- Excellent introduction to alt. ed.
- More time.
- Nancy was excellent - more time maybe.

Information learned from session, future use for information:

- Good information to have if I were to be in a possible alt. ed. situation.
- Obtaining information on the requirements to start and maintain various programs.
- I will be taking this back to the administration for the AEP corrections program.
- Importance of written policies.
- I intend to try to get more peer tutors and outside speakers for my program.
- I will further my readings.
- We meet the requirements to apply for alt. ed. and I plan to implement that process.

.

2006 IDEA Update

Participants of the N & D symposium were asked to indicate their opinions on various aspects of each breakout session. A rating scale of 1 to 3 was used, where 1= poor, 2= satisfactory, and 3= excellent. Participants were also asked to comment on the most useful aspects of the session, the things they could change to improve the session, as well as what was learned from the session and how they intended to use their newly acquired knowledge in their professional activities.

Eighteen participants completed an evaluation for the breakout session, **2006 IDEA Update**. Mean scores ranged from 2.72 (the utility of materials provided) to 2.83 (the presenters' approach to convey program content) indicating an 'excellent' level of satisfaction with the session. Respondents suggested the materials were excellent. The general update and information pertaining to IEP's were the most useful aspects of the session. The recommendation for improvement in this session centered on providing even more detail about IEP's. Respondents indicated that they would share the update information with teachers and staff.

2006 IDEA Update

Presented by: Mr. Jay Mokowitz

November 8, 2006

(3=Excellent; 1=Poor)

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Mean
The overall session information presented was:	18	2.78
Presenter's understanding of program content was:	18	2.83
Presenter's ability to actively engage you was:	18	2.78
The utility of the materials provided was:	18	2.72
The quality of the materials provided was:	18	2.78
The overall organization of the session was:	18	2.78
Valid N (listwise)	18	

What is your current position?

	Frequency	Percent
Administrator	11	61.1
Teacher	3	16.7
Facility Staff	2	11.1
Other	2	11.1
Total	18	100.0

In what type of program are you employed?

	Frequency	Percent
State Institution	5	27.8
Neglected	9	50.0
Delinquent	3	16.7
LEA	1	5.6
Total	18	100.0

Open Ended Comments: **These responses have not been edited for language usage, spelling, etc., and appear exactly as provided by the respondents.**

Most useful about the break-out session:

- Helpful review.
- Clear presentation of most recent update.
- Very good information, overall.
- Having actual examples of IEP and other handouts to take back to staff.
- IEP timeline, role of surrogate parent, R.T.I.
- Timelines and regulations regarding evaluations.
- Obtaining information on what constitutes a "Highly Qualified Teacher."
- Info. provided was clear.
- Knowledge of the regulations update.

Improvement of breakout session:

- Did not need improvements.
- Give more information on non-teachers and the Praxis test.
- More detail about covering the IEP.

Information learned from session, future use for information:

- Contacts for additional information.
- Will share the info with teachers at my site.

Integrating Guided Reading into Your Education Program

Participants of the N & D symposium were asked to indicate their opinions on various aspects of each breakout session. A rating scale of 1 to 3 was used, where 1= poor, 2= satisfactory, and 3= excellent. Participants were also asked to comment on the most useful aspects of the session, the things they could change to improve the session, as well as what was learned from the session and how they intended to use their newly acquired knowledge in their professional activities.

Seventeen participants completed an evaluation for the breakout session, **Integrating Guided Reading into Your Education Program**. Mean scores ranged from 2.71 (the utility of the materials provided) 2.88 (the presenter's ability to convey the program content.) indicating an 'excellent' level of satisfaction with the session. Respondents suggested the materials were excellent. All of the information on starting and utilizing a Guided Reading program was considered the most useful aspect of this event. The only recommendation for improvement in this session was to make the session less lecture like and more interactive. Respondents felt that the session was well planned, and indicated that they would investigate the visibility of implementing a Guided Reading Program at their institution.

Integrating Guided Reading into Your Education Program

Presented by: Ms. Cathryn Myers

November 9, 2006

(3=Excellent; 1=Poor)

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Mean
The overall session information presented was:	17	2.82
Presenter's understanding of program content was:	17	2.88
Presenter's ability to actively engage you was:	17	2.59
The utility of the materials provided was::	17	2.71
The quality of the materials provided was:	17	2.76
The overall organization of the session was:	17	2.82
Valid N (listwise)	17	

What is your current position?

	Frequency	Percent
Administrator	5	29.4
Teacher	11	64.7
Other	1	5.9
Total	17	100.0

In what type of program are you employed?

	Frequency	Percent
State Institution	4	23.5
Neglected	9	52.9
Delinquent	2	11.8
LEA	2	11.8
Total	17	100.0

Open Ended Comments: **These responses have not been edited for language usage, spelling, etc., and appear exactly as provided by the respondents.**

Most useful about the break-out session:

- Instructor's background knowledge - information intro. & overview of guided material.
- How to setup a guided reading classroom, what to expect/watch for that may or may not work.
- How this school district solved problems involved with setting up a guided reading program.
- Information on where to find training and materials for guided reading.
- I would like to find out more about guided reading and materials.
- Well organized presentation on developing a guided reading program from scratch.
- Some good resources for locating leveled books.

Improvement of breakout session:

- Add 2nd session seeing what guided reading looks like when implemented reading materials to actually use.
- Focus/target - elementary to my situation (secondary).
- Good as is expect it should end on time.
- More involvement as a class. Presenter was extremely knowledgeable and well spoken but too lecture like.
- Make it more lively, examples of materials used. How program is implemented.

Information learned from session, future use for information:

- Sharing what and what did not work in setting up the reading programs. How and Where to find book selections.
- Make staff aware of monthly.
- We are setting up a guided reading so this was very helpful. Also liked the one (of two) handouts I received.
- I will investigate BER. I will investigate Mondo.

Motivation Through the Outdoor Classroom

Participants of the N & D symposium were asked to indicate their opinions on various aspects of each breakout session. A rating scale of 1 to 3 was used, where 1= poor, 2= satisfactory, and 3= excellent. Participants were also asked to comment on the most useful aspects of the session, the things they could change to improve the session, as well as what was learned from the session and how they intended to use their newly acquired knowledge in their professional activities.

Eighteen participants completed an evaluation for the breakout session, **Motivation Through the Outdoor Classroom**. Mean scores ranged from 2.83 (the presenters' ability to engage the participants and the utility and quality of the materials provided) 3.00 (the presenter's ability to convey the program content.) indicating an 'excellent' level of satisfaction with the session. Respondents suggested the materials were excellent. Seeing the creative way funds can be utilized was considered the most useful aspects of this event. Recommendations for the session centered on having more pictures of the created trails. Respondents indicated the session inspired them to find more inventive ways to educate their students.

Motivation Through the Outdoor Classroom

Presented by: Mr. Douglas Carlquist & Mr. Mike Henkel

November 9, 2006

(3=Excellent; 1=Poor)

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Mean
The overall session information presented was:	18	2.94
Presenter's understanding of program content was:	18	3.00
Presenter's ability to actively engage you was:	18	2.83
The utility of the materials provided was:	18	2.83
The quality of the materials provided was:	18	2.83
The overall organization of the session was:	18	2.89
Valid N (listwise)	18	

What is your current position?

	Frequency	Percent
Administrator	14	77.8
Teacher	3	16.7
Other	1	5.6
Total	18	100.0

In what type of program are you employed?

	Frequency	Percent
State Institution	1	5.6
Neglected	15	83.3
Delinquent	2	11.1
Total	18	100.0

Open Ended Comments: **These responses have not been edited for language usage, spelling, etc., and appear exactly as provided by the respondents.**

Most useful about the break-out session:

- Method of scheduling classroom time, breakfast, planning /organizational time, and actual trail time.
- Managing the daily schedule.
- How education is put into a nature setting which results in an educational learning exercises.
- Excellent use of Title I funds for creative learning.
- It's a fantastic idea for youth involvement on a large scale project.
- The integration of learning and team work.
- Provided new ways of delivering education.

Improvement of breakout session:

- More visuals and pics of the trail
- Please provide pics of trails.

Information learned from session, future use for information:

- Ideas for my own program.

N & D Title I On-Line Reporting

Participants of the N & D symposium were asked to indicate their opinions on various aspects of each breakout session. A rating scale of 1 to 3 was used, where 1= poor, 2= satisfactory, and 3= excellent. Participants were also asked to comment on the most useful aspects of the session, the things they could change to improve the session, as well as what was learned from the session and how they intended to use their newly acquired knowledge in their professional activities.

Eighteen participants completed an evaluation for the breakout session, **N & D Title I On-line Reporting**. Mean scores for the entire session was 4.00 indicating an 'excellent' level of satisfaction with this aspect of the symposium. Respondents noted the materials were great and will be shared with colleagues at their facility. Having the general update for next year's reporting was considered the most useful aspects of this event. No improvements were reported for this session. Respondents indicated that would make changes to this year's form, when they return to their institution.

N & D Title I On-Line Reporting

Presented by: Ms. Tammy Soltis

November 8, 2006

(3=Excellent; 1=Poor)

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Mean
The overall session information presented was:	18	3.00
Presenter's understanding of program content was:	18	3.00
Presenter's ability to actively engage you was:	18	3.00
The utility of the materials provided was:	18	3.00
The quality of the materials provided was:	18	3.00
The overall organization of the session was:	18	3.00
Valid N (listwise)	18	

What is your current position?

	Frequency	Percent
Administrator	9	50.0
Teacher	5	27.8
Facility Staff	2	11.1
Other	2	11.1
Total	18	100.0

In what type of program are you employed?

	Frequency	Percent
Neglected	12	66.7
LEA	6	33.3
Total	18	100.0

Open Ended Comments: **These responses have not been edited for language usage, spelling, etc., and appear exactly as provided by the respondents.**

Most useful about the break-out session:

- Explained changes in the system so we know what to expect for next year.
- Next year's reporting will probably take more time - so knowing this ahead of time is valuable.
- The changes in the reporting system and how to do the reports via internet.
- How to negotiate through the process.
- Being "new" at this I think everything was important.
- Very helpful to see the system.

Improvement of breakout session:

- Very good and complete.

Information learned from session, future use for information:

- Why we make the report. How we make the report. What happens with the data.
- Changes in reporting in the handout very easy.
- Go back and make corrections.
- Discharge date must be actually discharged date, not last day of school year.

Practical Implementation of a Circle Process

Participants of the N & D symposium were asked to indicate their opinions on various aspects of each breakout session. A rating scale of 1 to 3 was used, where 1= poor, 2= satisfactory, and 3= excellent. Participants were also asked to comment on the most useful aspects of the session, the things they could change to improve the session, as well as what was learned from the session and how they intended to use their newly acquired knowledge in their professional activities.

Eleven participants completed an evaluation for the breakout session, **Practical Implementation of a Circle Process**. Mean scores ranged from 2.55 (the utility and quality of the materials provided.) to 3.00 (the presenters' ability to convey the program content), indicating an 'excellent' level of satisfaction with this aspect of the symposium. Respondents indicated the Circle Process itself was considered the most useful aspects of this event. The main recommendation for improvement in this session was to provide samples and demonstration of the circle process. Respondents indicated that they would use the process at their institution.

Practical Implementation of a Circle Process

Presented by: Ms. Pam Walker

November 9, 2006

(3=Excellent; 1=Poor)

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Mean
The overall session information presented was:	11	2.64
Presenter's understanding of program content was:	11	3.00
Presenter's ability to actively engage you was:	11	2.91
The utility of the materials provided was:	11	2.55
The quality of the materials provided was:	11	2.55
The overall organization of the session was:	11	2.64
Valid N (listwise)	11	

What is your current position?

	Frequency	Percent
Administrator	9	81.8
Other	2	18.2
Total	11	100.0

In what type of program are you employed?

	Frequency	Percent
State Institution	1	9.1
Neglected	6	54.5
Delinquent	3	27.3
LEA	1	9.1
Total	11	100.0

Open Ended Comments: **These responses have not been edited for language usage, spelling, etc., and appear exactly as provided by the respondents.**

Most useful about the break-out session:

- Great session!
- Circle process!

Improvement of breakout session:

- I would have liked to learn more specific information on the circle process and how to use it.
- Sample circle, handouts.
- More info. on running circles less on statistics.
- Demonstration of circle, providing resources and use.

Information learned from session, future use for information:

- Would have liked more info. on running circles. I think they would be great for our school.
- Was hoping for more training info. to take to my staff.
- Would consider doing circles to start each day.

Pre-Voc: A Passport to Professionalism

Participants of the N & D symposium were asked to indicate their opinions on various aspects of each breakout session. A rating scale of 1 to 3 was used, where 1= poor, 2= satisfactory, and 3= excellent. Participants were also asked to comment on the most useful aspects of the session, the things they could change to improve the session, as well as what was learned from the session and how they intended to use their newly acquired knowledge in their professional activities.

Eighteen participants completed an evaluation for the breakout session, **Pre-Voc: A Passport to Professionalism**. Mean scores ranged from 2.78 (the utility of the materials.) to 2.83 (all other aspects of the session) indicating an 'excellent' level of satisfaction with this aspect of the symposium. Respondents noted the materials were great and will be shared with colleagues at their facility. Respondents indicated the learning modules were considered the most useful aspects of this event. The main recommendation for improvement in this session was to provide a sufficient number of handouts. Respondents indicated that they would share the information with colleagues at their institution.

Pre-Voc: A Passport to Professionalism

Presented by: Ms. Judy Letcavage & Ms. Kathy Jeremiah

November 9, 2006

(3=Excellent; 1=Poor)

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Mean
The overall session information presented was:	18	2.83
Presenter's understanding of program content was:	18	2.83
Presenter's ability to actively engage you was:	18	3.83
The utility of the materials provided was:	18	2.78
The quality of the materials provided was:	18	2.83
The overall organization of the session was:	18	2.83
Valid N (listwise)	18	

What is your current position?

	Frequency	Percent
State Institution	8	44.4
Neglected	4	22.2
Delinquent	5	27.8
LEA	1	5.6
Total	18	100.0

In what type of program are you employed?

	Frequency	Percent
Administrator	7	38.9
Teacher	9	50.0
Facility Staff	1	5.6
Other	1	5.6
Total	18	100.0

Open Ended Comments: **These responses have not been edited for language usage, spelling, etc., and appear exactly as provided by the respondents.**

Most useful about the break-out session:

- That incarcerated people have an opportunity to educate themselves concerning vocational training.
- That there is a structured program to help students learn about functioning in a responsible work environment.
- Learning about the modules.
- The printed materials and sources.
- The whole works - this looks like a very valuable program.
- This was a very useful session. Highly informative- shared resources and showed great enthusiasm for their jobs.
- I will be able to find a use, the resources very readily! Thanks.

Improvement of breakout session:

- Couldn't - it was great.
- Having a sufficient number of materials.

Information learned from session, future use for information:

- Website address - will share with staff at institution.

Relevant, Ready, Reliable: User/Student Friendly Assessments

Participants of the N & D symposium were asked to indicate their opinions on various aspects of each breakout session. A rating scale of 1 to 3 was used, where 1= poor, 2= satisfactory, and 3= excellent. Participants were also asked to comment on the most useful aspects of the session, the things they could change to improve the session, as well as what was learned from the session and how they intended to use their newly acquired knowledge in their professional activities.

Twenty-seven participants completed an evaluation for the breakout session, **Relevant, Ready, Reliable: User/Student Friendly Assessments**. Mean scores ranged from 2.85 (the utility of the materials provided) to 2.93 (the presenter's approach to convey the program content, the quality of the materials provided, and the overall organization of the session) indicating an 'excellent' level of satisfaction with the session. The knowledge of the presenters' considered the most useful aspect of this event. The only recommendation for improvement in this session was for the presenters to reframe from reading off the PowerPoint document. Respondents indicated that they will share the information from this session with the teachers at their institutions.

Relevant, Ready, Reliable: User/Student Friendly Assessments

Presented by: Ms. Susan Sauerland, Ms. Susan Boring, Ms. Carole Cyphert, &
Ms. Patricia

November 9, 2006

(3=Excellent; 1=Poor)

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Mean
The overall session information presented was:	27	2.89
Presenter's understanding of program content was:	27	2.93
Presenter's ability to actively engage you was:	27	2.89
The utility of the materials provided was::	27	2.85
The quality of the materials provided was:	27	2.93
The overall organization of the session was:	27	2.93
Valid N (listwise)	27	

What is your current position?

	Frequency	Percent
Administrator	17	63.0
Teacher	10	37.0
Total	27	100.0

In what type of program are you employed?

	Frequency	Percent
State Institution	8	29.6
Neglected	10	37.0
Delinquent	7	25.9
LEA	2	7.4
Total	27	100.0

Open Ended Comments: **These responses have not been edited for language usage, spelling, etc., and appear exactly as provided by the respondents.**

Most useful about the break-out session:

- I truly appreciated the knowledge of the presenters, which was imparted about various learning styles.
- I enjoyed the learning styles profile. The presenters were so personal and they displayed a grand sense of humor!
- The premise of teaching strengths.
- Helped me to realize that students really do learn differently.
- Use of multiple intelligence theory and rubric creation.
- Good interaction exercise.
- Ineffectiveness of traditional assessment when teaching to multiple intelligences.

Improvement of breakout session:

- Very good as is!
- Make activities to illustrate multiple intelligence.
- Too much reading directly from slides. At time poor eye contact/interaction with attendees. Should be 2 sessions.
- Please do not read the PowerPoint.
-

Information learned from session, future use for information:

- Review of all modalities and ways to implement them.
- I will train my teachers in this.
- I can use this to help teachers I work with to see there are so many other ways to teach.

Title I & the Monitoring Instrument

Participants of the N & D symposium were asked to indicate their opinions on various aspects of each breakout session. A rating scale of 1 to 3 was used, where 1= poor, 2= satisfactory, and 3= excellent. Participants were also asked to comment on the most useful aspects of the session, the things they could change to improve the session, as well as what was learned from the session and how they intended to use their newly acquired knowledge in their professional activities.

Twenty-six participants completed an evaluation for the breakout session, **Title I & the Monitoring Instrument**. Mean scores ranged from 2.73 (the quality of the materials provided) to 3.00 (the presenter's approach to convey the program content.) indicating an 'excellent' level of satisfaction with this aspect of the conference. Respondents indicated that materials presented in the session were excellent. Respondents indicated the use of the monitoring instrument and learning about the responsibilities of the LEA's were the most useful aspects of this event. The main recommendations for improvement in this session was add additional information (i.e., more detailed hands-on explanations) to the handouts. Respondents indicated that they would present the information learned from the session to colleagues at there institution.

Title I & the Monitoring Instrument

Presented by: Dr. Randy Ireson

November 8, 2006

(3=Excellent; 1=Poor)

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Mean
The overall session information presented was:	26	2.88
Presenter's understanding of program content was:	26	3.00
Presenter's ability to actively engage you was:	26	2.92
The utility of the materials provided was:	26	2.81
The quality of the materials provided was:	26	2.73
The overall organization of the session was:	26	2.85
Valid N (listwise)	26	

What is your current position?

	Frequency	Percent
Administrator	18	69.2
Teacher	5	19.2
Facility Staff	1	3.8
Other	2	7.7
Total	26	100.0

In what type of program are you employed?

	Frequency	Percent
State Institution	2	7.7
Neglected	15	57.7
Delinquent	3	11.5
LEA	6	23.1
Total	26	100.0

Open Ended Comments: **These responses have not been edited for language usage, spelling, etc., and appear exactly as provided by the respondents.**

Most useful about the break-out session:

- Information regarding changes in monitoring and LEA agreements.
- Overview of process changes.
- The explanation regarding form changes, the e-grant process, sign-off requirements and monitoring expectation all sub-part II facilities.
- Having the monitoring tool and receiving explanation of the regulations and what to prepare for a monitoring visit.
- The regs. and monitoring tool will be shared with all the institutions in our area.
- Getting a copy of the new monitoring instrument and regs.

Improvement of breakout session:

- Obtaining information that must be submitted. Sharing info. between institutions and LEA's.
- More detailed hands-on information available.
- Having sufficient handouts.

Information learned from session, future use for information:

- I will share this document with my staff and admin. Assistant.
- It was helpful to have Joe Hiznay present to elaborate on some of Greg's points.
- I will share the information with each of our institutions.

To Mentor or Not to Mentor, Who Really Learns?

Participants of the N & D symposium were asked to indicate their opinions on various aspects of each breakout session. A rating scale of 1 to 3 was used, where 1= poor, 2= satisfactory, and 3= excellent. Participants were also asked to comment on the most useful aspects of the session, the things they could change to improve the session, as well as what was learned from the session and how they intended to use their newly acquired knowledge in their professional activities.

Twenty-five participants completed an evaluation for the breakout session, **To Mentor or Not to Mentor, Who Really Learns?** Mean scores ranged from 2.72 (the quality of the materials provided) to 2.92 (the presenter's approach to convey the program content.) indicating an 'excellent' level of satisfaction with this aspect of the conference. Respondents indicated that materials presented in the session were excellent. Respondents indicated the overall program was the most useful aspects of this event. No recommendations were suggested for this session. Respondents indicated that they would present the information learned from the session to the supervisors at there institution, in hopes of starting their own program.

To Mentor or Not to Mentor, Who Really Learns?

Presented by: Ms. Cynthia Kechisen

November 9, 2006

(3=Excellent; 1=Poor)

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Mean
The overall session information presented was:	25	2.80
Presenter's understanding of program content was:	25	2.92
Presenter's ability to actively engage you was:	25	2.88
The utility of the materials provided was:	25	2.76
The quality of the materials provided was:	25	2.72
The overall organization of the session was:	25	2.84
Valid N (listwise)	25	

What is your current position?

	Frequency	Percent
Administrator	18	72.0
Teacher	4	16.0
Facility Staff	2	8.0
Other	1	4.0
Total	25	100.0

In what type of program are you employed?

	Frequency	Percent
State Institution	8	32.0
Neglected	9	36.0
Delinquent	7	28.0
LEA	1	4.0
Total	25	100.0

Open Ended Comments: **These responses have not been edited for language usage, spelling, etc., and appear exactly as provided by the respondents.**

Most useful about the break-out session:

- The self-assessment will be useful.
- I've learned that I would be a good mentor because I have a positive attitude and I am flexible.
- She reminded us to accept the children where they are and not where they've been.
- I had thought this was for mentoring "youth" not "peers." but, overall it did give some thoughts to ponder.
- The issues of matching up the mentors.
- The overall program.

Improvement of breakout session:

- None.

Information learned from session, future use for information:

- I will pass this info. on to our career development instructors. The self-assessment will be useful for our students.
- We do have supervisors who are not doing well enough and perhaps this would be a way to go.
- Yes. Will go back and utilize the concepts presented.
- Will share with supervisors and the importance of mentoring as well as coaching.

Youthwork in Action: Running an Alternative School for Disruptive Students as a Therapeutic Community

Participants of the N & D symposium were asked to indicate their opinions on various aspects of each breakout session. A rating scale of 1 to 3 was used, where 1= poor, 2= satisfactory, and 3= excellent. Participants were also asked to comment on the most useful aspects of the session, the things they could change to improve the session, as well as what was learned from the session and how they intended to use their newly acquired knowledge in their professional activities.

Eighteen participants completed an evaluation for the breakout session, **Youthwork in Action: Running an Alternative School for Disruptive Students as a Therapeutic Community**. Mean scores ranged from 2.38 (the overall session information) to 2.67 (the presenter's approach to convey the program content.) indicating a 'good' to 'excellent' level of satisfaction with this aspect of the conference. Respondents indicated that materials presented in the session were useful. Respondents indicated that learning about Youthworks was the most useful aspects of this event. Recommendations for the session included, making it longer, but respondents insisted that the session was very good.

Youthwork in Action: Running an Alternative School for Disruptive Students as a Therapeutic Community

Presented by: Mr. Pete Stollery & Mr. Greg Melito

November 8, 2006

(3=Excellent; 1=Poor)

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Mean
The overall session information presented was:	18	2.38
Presenter's understanding of program content was:	18	2.67
Presenter's ability to actively engage you was:	18	2.56
The utility of the materials provided was:	18	2.50
The quality of the materials provided was:	18	2.50
The overall organization of the session was:	18	2.39
Valid N (listwise)	18	

What is your current position?

	Frequency	Percent
Administrator	11	61.1
Teacher	4	22.2
Facility Staff	1	5.6
Other	2	11.1
Total	18	100.0

In what type of program are you employed?

	Frequency	Percent
State Institution	3	16.7
Neglected	10	55.6
Delinquent	4	22.2
LEA	1	5.6
Total	18	100.0

Open Ended Comments: **These responses have not been edited for language usage, spelling, etc., and appear exactly as provided by the respondents.**

Most useful about the break-out session:

- Hearing "Greg" speak as a former student.
- That children or teenagers can learn in an environment conducive to them. Let them experience that they are unique and different.
- Learning about youthwork in action.
- Self-regulatory monitoring is important for teenagers.
- Another perspective of handling youth.
- Explaining how to begin TC & how we progress.
- Wonderfully informative.

Improvement of breakout session:

- Very good already.
- Longer session. Valuable concepts that really do apply!

Information learned from session, future use for information:

- No responses.