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Abstract

Low- or non-achievement by students has historically been a problem for teachers and administrators, as well as for parents and students. Same grade retention has been proven by many researchers to be non-productive and in many cases, punitive. The Cumberland Helpers in Partnerships (CHIPS) program was begun at Cumberland Elementary and Junior High School as an interventive measure to combat this problem of low achievement. Sixth, seventh, and eighth grade students who were considered academically at risk at the end of the first semester of the 1995-1996 school year (N=78) were asked to voluntarily attend tutoring sessions to help improve their grades. Academically proficient junior high students were selected as tutors and they took part in ten training sessions throughout the 18 week tutoring period. Training sessions were conducted by a certified staff member. Tutors were in the tutoring lab four days per week for the 18 week period. At risk students voluntarily self-selected whether they were a member of the experimental group or the control group, depending on whether they attended the tutoring sessions a pre-determined number of times. The experimental group of students (N=29) were those who attended at least 36 of the 72 sessions. The control group (N=49) were those who attended less than 36 of the 72 sessions. Three t-tests were conducted on these at risk students. A pre-program grade point average (GPA) was taken from official school records for each student. At the end of the 18 week period, a post-program GPA was taken for each student. It was found by this researcher that after examination of the mean scores for both pre- and post-program on both the experimental as well as the control group, more academic progress was made by the control group than the experimental group. A suggestion for further research is recommended in the areas of grades as they impact self-esteem and self-image, and the correlation, if any, between students' grades and parent involvement in the education process.
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CHAPTER ONE
Overview of the Problem

Introduction

Success in a child's academic subjects is a prerequisite for success in that child's educational career. There are many dynamics which are involved in ensuring that success will be forthcoming. Schools have little or no control over many of the factors which do or do not place education as a priority in each child's life; however, it is the intent as educators to provide the best opportunity possible for each child to succeed.

With the new push towards minimum skills competency and state mandated testing at specified grade and subject levels, educators are being held more and more accountable for students' achievement levels (Smith & Others, 1991). This pressure causes educators, in turn, to examine viable means of improving students' academic achievement as being measured by their grade point averages in the five main academic subjects of English, reading, science, social studies, and math.

Historically, grade retention has been used as a means of raising students' competencies, with some educators feeling that giving the child an extra year in which to grow and raise deficit skill levels before being passed on to the next grade level, will be an adequate means to the desired educational end. However, research has shown that retention simply sends the child back through the same system which
failed the student before (Delidow, 1989). Additionally, poor student attitudes are often created by the retention process, and these negative attitudes are extremely counterproductive to improved levels of achievement (Rihl, et. al, 1988).

One of the main goals in education is to give each child the best opportunity for the best education possible. At the same time, attention should be directed toward helping each child to establish and to nurture a positive self-image. Since students' attitudes toward self are often based on levels of perceived success in school (Cuddy, et al, 1987), a need therefore exists to find alternative, interventive methods of addressing the problem of poor academic achievement.

One such proposed method of raising students' grade point averages (GPA's) and of helping to establish a greater degree of academic success in school is through a peer tutoring program. Peer tutoring is not a new idea, having been used for years as a teaching and learning strategy both in school and in other settings. The ancient Greeks and Roman even used the idea of student tutors in their day. Comenius (1592-1670) supported tutoring and felt that it was of definite benefit to both the tutor and the tutee. The Montessori system, the one-room schoolhouse, and the Lancastrian approach all used students to help teach other students (Land & others, 1987).

In the last 25 years, educators have begun to take a second look at peer tutoring as a cost-effective and time-efficient method of individualizing a child's education. Peer tutoring has been used to improve students' word recognition (Chiang & Others, 1980), spelling (Delquadri, & Others, 1983), math (Sharpley & Others,
1983), and written capitalization (Campbell & Others, 1991). Study skills, also, may be a foreign concept for the at-risk student. Some students tend to misunderstand assignments, allow their attention to wander, disrupt the work of others, and miss opportunities to learn (Koskinen & Wilson, 1982). When these students are paired with peers who have developed these skills and they are able to see these skills modeled, they are more likely to begin to develop strategies of study which will enable them to better help themselves.

In some tutoring programs, students enter voluntarily into a peer tutoring relationship with another student of the same grade level. Other programs pair younger students with older students. Some pair academically gifted students with those who are experiencing deficits in their grades, and some programs approach the pairing in more of a co-operative learning atmosphere (Topping, 1988). This tutoring process is designed to assist deficient students to raise grades in their basic core subjects.

While improvements have been made in the educational process, much remains to be done, especially in terms of satisfying the specific and varied individual student needs. When the educational needs of the student are not met, they do not perform at a level consistent with their academic potential.

The purpose of this paper is to determine whether at risk junior high students at Cumberland Elementary and Junior High School in grades 6, 7, and 8 will experience a significant improvement in their GPA's after regularly participating in a
peer tutoring program. This study is designed to provide useful information for initiating change in the ways that current policies address the problem of low- or even non- achievement.

Statement of the Problem

Some learners in the junior high school grades are at risk for academic failure. Further, they are in need of educational interventions intended to increase their academic successes in the five main subject areas of English, reading, science, social studies, and math.

Grade reports indicated that at the end of the first semester of study for the school year of 1995-1996, Cumberland Junior High School, which is composed of grades 6, 7, and 8, had close to 29% of the student population who qualified for the "at risk" descriptor as indicated by those first semester grades. Students considered at risk were those receiving a minimum of two D's or one F on their grade cards in any of the core subjects. It was because of this high percentage of identified at risk students in the junior high school that a decision was made for a tutoring program.

The purpose of this study was to provide regular, interventive one-on-one peer tutoring instruction to identified at risk students in order to ascertain whether this type of compensatory instruction would serve to improve students' grades. If the program was successful, it would thereby assist in eliminating the "at risk"
identification and possible consideration of same-grade retention at the end of the school year. This program was called Cumberland Helpers in Partnerships (CHIPs).

In order to determine the effectiveness of the CHIPs program, a study was conducted on a group of Cumberland Junior High school students (N=78) who were in grades 6, 7, and 8, and were identified at the end of the first semester of study as being in the academically "at risk" range. Those students who voluntarily attended regular sessions of peer tutoring would be in the experimental group, and those who did not attend the required number of sessions would be in the control group. Individual grade point averages were taken prior to the beginning of the sessions and again at the end of the 18-week period of tutoring. Students' levels of improvement in the experimental group were then compared with students' levels of improvement in the control group.

**Assumptions of the Study**

The following assumptions underlie the study:

1. The relationship between participation in a peer tutoring program and increase in a student's academic achievement and GPA is valid and worthy of consideration.

2. The cause of an "at-risk" identification will be academic rather than relating to other factors.

3. The students will voluntarily attend at least 36 of the 72 regular
tutoring sessions.

4. Records will be kept of all at-risk students at the middle and end of each quarter beginning on January 15, 1996.

5. Officially recorded data of each student's GPA will be gathered at the end of the first semester and at the end of the second semester.

Limitations of the Study

This study has the following limitations:

1. Students studied will be limited to 6th, 7th, and 8th grade at risk students identified at the end of second quarter at Cumberland Elementary and Junior High School.

2. This study will be limited to the effects of regular attendance in a peer-tutoring program as a determining factor in raising students' GPA's.

3. The setting for this field experience is in the small rural town of Toledo, IL; therefore, results of this study may not be generalized to students in a city, suburban, or urban school.

4. This study will cover a time period of two quarters of study, beginning in January, 1996, and ending in May, 1996.

5. This study will neither consider nor evaluate social factors of students such as self-esteem or self-image, which may be problematic and may influence or be influenced by, grades.
6. This study will neither consider students who enter the peer-tutoring program after January, nor ones who moved from the district while in the program.

7. The focus of middle school students prevents generalizability to students of primary or secondary grade levels.

8. Students will attend CHIPS on a voluntary basis, therefore, motivational factors will not be considered as a basis for evaluation of this program.

Null Hypotheses

A. There will be no differences in the means of pre- and post-test GPA distributions.

B. There will be no differences in experimental and control post-test GPA measures.

Definitions of Terms

**Academic Achievement.** Knowledge attained or skills developed in the school subjects, usually designated by test scores or by marks assigned by teachers, or by both.

**At Risk Students.** Students who are at high risk for retention, based on low academic achievement.
**CHIPS.** An acronym which stands for Cumberland Helpers in Partnerships.

This is an interventive program created for Cumberland Junior High School designed to provide regular one-on-one peer tutoring to identified at risk students.

**Cognitive Development.** Development in the child's thought processes through adaptation to the environment and assimilation of information.

**Cognitive Skills.** Those skills which are indicative of the maturation process and levels of development.

**Compensatory Education.** An education program that seeks to compensate for environmental and experiential deficits in relation to such areas as schooling, housing, employment, cultural patterns, and life styles of minority groups; attempts to discover and develop the latent potential of the learner with emphasis on experiences, activities, and materials specifically designed for cognitive and motivational growth.

**Core Subjects.** The five main academic subjects which make up the core part of Cumberland Junior High Students' schedules. Those subjects are English, reading, science, social studies, and mathematics.

**Cross-age Tutoring.** A tutoring relationship where the tutor is older than the tutee by at least one year.

**Cumberland Elementary and Junior High School.** A rural school located midway between Greenup, IL, and Toledo IL, housing grades K-8. Also referred to as Cumberland Junior High School when pertaining only to grades six through eight.
**Extra Year Students.** Students who are in a particular grade but are a year older than the grade norm students as a result of either repeating a grade or attending a transitional class.

**GPA.** Acronym standing for Grade Point Average--the mean score from the five basic subjects of English, reading, science, social studies, and math.

**Grade Retention.** The practice of keeping a child back in the same grade for another year due to poor achievement. Also referred to as held back, repeating, nonpromotion, or failure.

**Low Achieving Students.** Those whose skill levels are not up to grade level norms as measured on basic assessments.

**Minimal Basic Skills Competencies.** That level of skill competency which the governing group has deemed to be the lowest possible level of attainment to be still passing.

**Peer Tutoring.** A process of being assisted in one's studies by an individual whose cognitive development is more advanced.

**Same Age Student.** Students of the same year of birth--not necessarily in the same grade level.

**Social Promotion.** Promotion to the next higher grade based upon factors other than achievement, e.g., age and size.
CHAPTER TWO

Review of Literature and Related Research

Review of Literature

In a study by Fasko (1994), fourth and fifth grade students (N=8) from a combined classroom in an Appalachian elementary school were given peer tutoring assistance to aid in fluency in basic math facts. Peer tutoring sessions occurred two to three times per week for about 15-20 minutes at a time. Data from multiplication fact probes and worksheets indicated that 1) Improvement in fluency occurred for six of the eight students; 2) All students showed some degree of improvement on worksheets during intervention; 3) The treatment promoted retention of information over several weeks' time.

Reading achievement of learning-disabled students and nondisabled, low-performing readers in academically integrated classrooms was examined in a study by Simmons & others (1995). It was found that those students who received peer tutoring scored higher on reading fluency and comprehension than did students in a control group.

Mieux (1993) detailed a study aimed to increase academic competence in math and/or reading and to improve study skills of at risk students (N=27) who were referred by their classroom teachers for compensatory instruction. A before school peer and cross-age tutoring program for at risk students was developed. Students completed school assignments in tutoring sessions by using manipulatives and technology. Results of this study were positive. Post-test scores of the Numbers Test for math development and the
Protege Reading Test measuring reading improvement were improved from pre-test scores. A teacher survey reported improved study skill usage, as well as improved skills in reading, language arts, and mathematics. Report card grades were higher at the close of the intervention.

A sixth grade classroom in a multicultural, multi-social economic district located in a three-county area northwest of Chicago, IL, was the object of a study by Galezio & Others (1994). Peer tutoring was used to improve the progress of average and below average readers. Analysis of probable cause data revealed that many readers lacked quality time spent practicing reading at home and in school with teachers and other students. Although students reported valuing reading, poor attitudes and lack of motivation were apparent. Solution strategies consisted of peer tutoring supported by social skill instruction designed to improve on-task time, allow for individual reading instruction, improve self esteem, and improve attitudes toward reading. Results indicated that peer tutoring had a positive impact on all children. Reading abilities and students' attitudes were maintained, and in many cases, improved.

A study by Mooney (1986) was concerned with the effect of tutoring by eighth grade students on the reading achievement of fourth graders. Subjects (N=30) were randomly assigned to either a control group (N=15) or an experimental group (N=15). Tutoring sessions took place in an after school setting. Tutees were pretested using the Gates-MacGintie Reading Tests, tutored for ten weeks, and then post-tested, using an alternate form of the same standardized testing instrument. An analysis of pre-test scores showed there to be no significant differences in scores between the experimental group and the control group. In analysis of the post-test scores, it was found that greater gains were made by the experimental group in the areas of vocabulary, comprehension, and total reading achievement. Further supporting evidence was found in the conversion of mean raw scores for total reading into grade equivalent scores for both groups. The experimental sample showed a gain of five months more than did the control sample.
A study conducted on fifth grade students (N=12) was designed to address the cognitive and affective needs of underachieving students in a suburban school in southwest Florida (Perry, 1991). Tutees were paired with same age tutors who provided supplemental reading instruction four times a week over a 12-week period. Tutees also participated in weekly brainstorming sessions with the researcher and a certified elementary guidance counselor to help them to gain insight into the behaviors and conditions which were hampering their academic progress. Results indicated that the target group made gains in reading levels, self esteem, and on daily English assignments.

Second graders (N=4) and third graders (N=4) were targeted in a study conducted by Bowers (1991). These targeted students did not produce the quantity of daily work required by their teachers, but scored too high on psychological tests for placement in special programs. They also scored below the 35th percentile in reading on the California Test of Basic Skills. Students were pretested with a measure from the Basal Reading Magazine. Activities such as working in matched pairs on daily assignments and applying critical thinking skills to reading activities were implemented. Tutees studied reading with peer tutors 30 minutes each day for 12 weeks. When the students were post-tested with the pretest measure, they scored between 95 and 100 percent on the post-test.

A study by McAllister (1989) was done to investigate the neurological impress method in peer tutoring during reading instruction. This is a method of unison reading in which the student and tutor read aloud simultaneously and quickly with the student placed slightly in front of the tutor so that the tutor's voice is directed into the student's right ear at close range. Fourth grade students (N=10) received treatment administered by cross-age tutors of the sixth grade. They worked 15 minutes daily for 12 consecutive weeks, resulting in total contact time of 15 hours. Tutors were specially trained by a reading specialist, and library books used were chosen by the fourth grade students. The Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test was used to determine a mental age and I.Q. based on functioning vocabulary. From the I.Q. measure, each child's reading expectancy level
could be computed and used to determine how much growth might be expected. Prior to
treatment, the Silvaroli Informal Reading Inventory, Form A, was administered to each
child to obtain oral reading levels in word recognition and comprehension. Form B was
used as a post-test after treatment. The Houghton Mifflin Silent Reading Placement Test
was used to determine each student’s silent reading level. Results indicated that each
fourth grade student showed reading improvement of at least one half year in the 12
weeks. The highest gain was 3 years in oral word recognition and 2 years in oral
comprehension and silent reading.

Fifth grade students (N=91) participated in a study which measured the effects
of peer tutoring on student perceptions of class environment, adjustment, and academic
performance. Results of this study compared the experimental group (N=45) to the
control group (N=46). Before and after the intervention, the Classroom Environment
Scale and a school opinion survey were used to assess the students' views of the
classroom. Students completed self esteem and peer sociometric rating measures, and
teacher submitted adjustment ratings and social studies report card and average monthly
grade were recorded. After the intervention, the experimental group, as compared to the
control group, saw their classes as more involved, orderly and organized, and competitive.
They reported being happier in class and enjoyed aspects of their school work more. Both
groups improved in peer liking, though the control group measured more improvement
than the experimental group. Teachers rated the experimental group as having increased
competence and a decrease in problems after the program. Further, the experimental
group did significantly better than the control group both on report cards and monthly
social studies grades.
Related Research--Co-operative Learning.

Another method of peer tutoring used by educators with their students is through a process called co-operative learning. In this method, students are randomly paired and work with peers to enhance learning.

A study conducted by Correa (1995), reports that in an effort coordinated with teachers of English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL), ninth grade students (N=90) were assigned to cooperative learning groups and given specific projects corresponding to the science curriculum, but requiring exploratory and investigative methods rather than reading from a textbook. Results indicate that project objectives were met in student achievement on a teacher-made criterion-referenced post test; majority of the students passed the course with a C or better grade; more entries in that year's science fair; regular student participation in hands-on classroom activities; improved student attitudes toward science; use of alternative student evaluation techniques; and parent contact.

Butkowski & Others (1994) detail a report describing a program for improving higher order thinking skills in mathematics of third grade (N=17), fifth grade (N=27), and sixth grade (N=27) students in a middle class community. Three interventions were chosen: 1) cooperative learning to develop student self-confidence and to improve student achievement, 2) the instruction of students in mathematical problem-solving strategies, and 3) curriculum revision with the addition of a supplementary program on mathematical problem solving. All strategic solutions were related to improving student cognition and advancing student achievement on higher-order thinking skills. All of the components that contributed to the original problem were reduced as projected. Student acquisition of mathematical problem solving strategies became evident, student confidence levels in mathematics increased, and student achievement on non-routine problems requiring higher order thinking skills improved. Problem solving pre- and post-tests,
student surveys, teacher questionnaires, teacher observation checklists, attitude surveys, student evaluation forms, and student reflection sheets were all used in the study to measure gains and improvements in cognitive and affective areas.

In a study by Hall & Others (1994), conducted in a low to middle class manufacturing community located in an urban area in northern Illinois, elementary grade students (N=29) were placed in a program intended to reduce the amount of teacher time spent correcting behavior and to raise low reading levels of students as evidenced by standardized reading test scores. Administration of a behavior checklist and a parent questionnaire confirmed the problem and described its extent. Analysis of probable cause data indicated that low levels of self esteem were an underlying factor in academic achievement and poor student behavior. Solution strategies suggested by examination of the professional literature available, combined with the analysis of the problem setting resulted in the selection of three major categories of intervention: 1) strategies to increase self esteem; 2) implementation of cooperative learning strategies; and 3) establishment of a cross age tutoring program. All strategic solutions were related to curricular revisions and altered teaching practices. All symptoms of the original problem were reduced as projected. Students' reading scores improved and the amount of positive student behavior increased.

A program of paired, repeated reading was developed by Frost (1990), to improve the achievement in reading comprehension of targeted third grade students (N=14). Three basic objectives of the program were to increase literal comprehension by 25%, to increase inference of main ideas by 25%, and to increase inference skills of drawing conclusions by 25%. The Qualitative Reading Inventory was administered to the students as both a pre- and post-test for assessment in these areas. The 14 week reading program involved a daily session of paired repeated reading incorporating critical thinking skills on alternate days. Results at the end of the program indicated that students
exceeded the anticipated objectives. Literal comprehension increased by 44%, main idea inference skills increased by 80%, and inference skills of drawing conclusions increased by 60%.

**Summary**

Peer tutoring, whether specifically same age tutoring, cross-age tutoring, or cooperative learning has been found to be an effective method of addressing improvements for low achieving students. All of the tutoring programs explored were deemed by their supervisors to be successful in raising students' grade point averages, cognitive levels, motivation levels, and levels of self-esteem.

An important aspect to consider is that simply putting two students together won't result in successful tutoring. Untrained tutors—whether adults or students—may resort to threats of punishment and scornful put-downs. Tutors need training to master effective tutorial and communication skills (Gaustad, 1993). They may be screened for desired attitudes or levels of academic competence.

In addition to the training sessions, tutors need ongoing supervision and support. Younger tutors will require more structure and closer supervision. In periodic group meetings, tutors can learn from each other's experiences as well as from staff, suggestions for handling problems. Support from both teachers and administrators is essential for a tutoring program to succeed in the long run (Gaustad, 1993).

**Uniqueness of Study**

There are several aspects of this study which make it unique and set apart from other organized programs of peer tutoring. The peer tutoring program was custom designed for Cumberland Junior High School, and the acronym CHIPS was established especially for this program. Standing for Cumberland Helpers in Partnerships, it has been
marketed to the teachers, the students, and the students' parents as a way to obtain help on their homework for the students which might otherwise not be available from any source.

This program was designed to be a voluntary program. Tutors volunteered and were subsequently trained over a 10 week period. Tutees' attendance was encouraged; however, it was ultimately left on a volunteer basis whether they came to the sessions, and they were left to choose which days they came and which they did not.

The CHIPs program was offered all year long, providing a continuous service to the student population. Services were available each weekday, Tuesday through Friday. Student tutors were available each day to assist with homework, studying for tests, or to help initiate better understanding of deficient subjects.

Since all students are bussed to the school site, it is often quite difficult to have students stay after school for help. In addition, extra-curricular activities which take place after school also compete for times which might be good for a peer tutoring program. It is for this reason that the times selected for the tutoring process would be as soon as the students arrive at school in the morning.

This project began at the beginning of the second semester in January, 1996, and ended at the end of the second semester in May, 1996, for a period of time totaling 18 weeks. The tutoring sessions began each morning, Tuesday through Friday, at 8:00 a.m. Students being tutored were asked to come directly from their busses to the tutoring lab and were to stay until 8:40. Since the time between 8:20 - 8:45 is a study/homeroom period for all junior high students, no student would be missing any instructional time by coming to the lab. Classroom teachers were all very cooperative in allowing students the freedom to attend the peer tutoring lab any days they desired. This was an important aspect of the program, because homeroom time was a time allotted each day for teachers to take attendance and lunch count and see that students were aware of morning announcements from the office. Each Monday was reserved for tutor training and discussion, so no students were tutored on that day.
The program was further established as a service organization whereby tutors were selected on a voluntary basis, coupled with examination of report card grades. Students had to have and must maintain all A's and B's on report cards each quarter. At the end of the year tutors received service pins for their dedication during the year in helping fellow students.

Additionally, the attendance of the tutees was designed to be voluntary. At risk students who wished to work on improvement in grades and homework assignments received explanations of what was expected of them concerning their attendance and what could be gained by coming for assistance, and from that information, they were left to make choices of when they would be coming to the lab for themselves. Parents were notified of the services being offered.
CHAPTER THREE
Research Design and Procedures

Procedures involved in this study are reviewed in this chapter in four sections. They are: overall design, sample and population, data collection, and instrumentation.

Overall Design

Pre/post comparisons between groups were conducted to study the relationship between a regular, organized program of peer tutoring designed to assist academically at risk students in their school subjects and their overall grade point averages as reflected in their report card grades. The population consisted of all Cumberland Elementary and Junior High School students in grades 6, 7, and 8 who received minimum grade levels of two D's or one F on their grade cards for the semester ending January 15, 1996. These students are referred to as the "at risk" students. Data on these at risk students were gathered twice on students' grade point averages as listed on official school records. Pre-program GPA's were gathered from official records dating January 15, 1996, and post-program GPA's were gathered at the end of the second semester of the school year on June 2, 1996. Pre-program scores were compared with post-program scores on both an experimental group of students as well as a control group. These scores were used to measure and reflect a relationship, if any, between a regular, organized program of peer tutoring and a student's GPA.

Sample and Population

The population consisted of all Cumberland Unit District #77 junior high school students who were in grades 6, 7, and 8, and who had been identified as of January 15, 1996 as being in the at risk category. Neither students who moved into the district after this date and who qualified for the identifier of "at risk" nor students who moved from the
district while in the program were considered as part of the sample population at completion and analysis of this study. Students were identified as being members of either an experimental group (N=29), or a control group (N=49). Demographics of the two groups indicated that the experimental group consisted of 12 girls and 17 boys. The control group consisted of 15 girls and 34 boys.

**Methodology**

**Parent and Teacher Meetings.** Planning for the CHIPs peer tutoring program at Cumberland Junior High School was begun by distributing a questionnaire among the junior high teachers. This questionnaire is included in Appendix A. The purpose of the survey of the teachers was to determine their perspectives of the problem of student achievement as it related specifically to the at risk student. The results of the survey suggested that teachers were overwhelmingly available for extra help to students at times which could be mutually arranged. Most teachers kept students updated on academic progress by figuring mid-quarter grades for all students. Teachers indicated that they welcomed parent-teacher conferences and saw these conferences as a valuable way to communicate concerns from both directions. Further, when questioned as to the primary reasons teachers felt that students were failing in their classes, consistent responses were the problems of excessive zeroes in the grade book caused by failing to turn in required assignments and students exhibiting poor organizational skills. This information came from a staff of 17 teachers, most of whom have more than 20 years in service to the school district as well as extensive education past the bachelor's degree.

In the beginning, a meeting was held with the junior high teachers as a group. It was the intention to determine the amount of cooperation to be expected from the staff, and to elicit from teachers whether or not they felt that there was a need for such a program. In gathering this information, it was felt that feasibility of the program could be determined.
When presented with the idea of the CHiPs tutoring program, positive feedback was given from the staff, and there was a great deal of enthusiasm and co-operation given among the staff for the implementation of the program. It was further expressed by some of the staff that there was a real need for our students who are experiencing difficulties in their schoolwork to have an alternative to simply not completing homework because of not understanding the principles needed to complete the work.

**Tutor Selection and Training.** As mentioned earlier, simply putting two students together won’t result in successful tutoring. Tutors must be trained not only in effective tutoring skills, but also in communication skills necessary to the helping profession. (Gaustad, 1993). Tutors should have times available periodically to express concerns and to ask questions relating to the areas of helping others.

In the beginning CHiPs program at Cumberland Junior High School, a meeting was held for all junior high students interested in the tutoring experience and who had received grades of no lower than one "C" in their basic core subjects. Students were given explanations of what needs the peer tutoring program was designed to meet, the attributes of a good peer tutor, what kind of time would be involved, responsibilities of training, responsibilities of commitment, and the need for maintaining a superior grade average. Students were also informed that the CHiPs program would be considered a service organization and tutor participants would be recognized at Awards Night at the end of the school year. There was a sign-up sheet available for those students who wanted to undergo the training and participate in the CHiPs tutoring program. In the end, twenty-eight tutors underwent the training and began the tutoring sessions.

At this time a schedule was made, and each tutor was assigned a particular day of the week that s/he would be responsible for coming into the lab at 8:00 a.m. for availability for tutoring. In addition to that one day per week for which each tutor was responsible, each could come in any other days to help out, and each was responsible also
for attending every Monday when there was no tutoring, but which was set aside for tutor training.

Tutor training was integrated into the schedule in the beginning of the program. Each Monday, tutors met together with this researcher to explore topics relevant to the process of peer tutoring and to communicate and discuss triumphs and concerns of the preceding week of tutoring. In addition, there were two other instructors available to the program on an "as needed" basis. There were 10 training sessions for the tutors in addition to four sessions intended as a reward for their services to the students. Topics for the training sessions are described in Appendix B and include developing an understanding of the peer tutoring concept; being aware of opportunities to help and teach each other; how to be assertive but not bossy; establishing rapport with tutees; developing a sensitivity to the needs of others; the differences between praise and put-downs; recognizing poor organizational skills; developing good study skills, critical thinking skills, summarizing and sequencing; addressing specific deficits noted in study or organizational skills; and establishing a positive but directive approach to the peer tutoring process. Role play was used as a learning activity in many of the training sessions.

In an effort to show support to the program, the CHIPS organization had four sessions which were intended to serve as indicators of appreciation of tutors' services from the staff members. Prizes were donated by the junior high teachers and names were drawn from a hat for the winners of these prizes. Names which went into the hat were the names of those tutors who had not missed a single session for which they were assigned.

On several occasions, the administration treated the tutors with juice and doughnuts for breakfast. This was provided on one of the days when tutors only attended sessions in the lab. All of these methods of reward served to indicate to the tutors a level of appreciation for time spent in reaching out to others.

**Identifying At Risk Participants.** The next step in the planning of the peer tutoring program was to determine which students met the guidelines of the definition of
at risk. Mid quarter grades were compiled from teachers at the middle of the first quarter of study. All students who received grades which included a minimum of two D's or one F in any of their five basic or core subjects were considered for our purposes as being at risk. Letters were then mailed out to parents of these students (N=80) inviting them to attend a meeting to discuss strategies for dealing with at risk students and for assisting in successes for these students. Further, at this meeting the CHIPs program was explained in detail to both students and parents, and encouragement for students to participate in the program was a focal point of the evening meeting. Informative materials were handed out to parents which included several suggestions for helping students deal with homework. Some of these items are included in the Appendices C, D, and E of this paper. In addition, an excellent video tape was shown detailing how to help children succeed with homework (Canter, 1992).

Since one of the main problems of at risk students is in organization, an assignment sheet was given to the parents as an example of one way in which to assist their child in knowing what work was to be completed and when it was to be due. An example of this assignment sheet is included in Appendix E.

Pilot Program. A pilot program of the CHIPs program was begun at the beginning of the second quarter of the year. At risk students were encouraged to voluntarily attend the sessions which began at 8:00 a.m. when the students began arriving to school on the school busses, and each session ended at 8:40 a.m., which was the end of the homeroom period. Teachers were very cooperative in allowing these students to attend tutoring sessions after having first checked into their first period homeroom classes. Attendance at these first few sessions was spotty, and tutors were encouraged to become ambassadors for the program. Gradually, over a period of the entire quarter, attendance strengthened, until finally the lab was quite well attended by those seeking assistance each day, Tuesday through Friday.
Implementation of the Program. At the end of the second quarter of study, grades were taken from official school records, and a determination was made of the number of students who would be considered at risk for the second semester of the year. Three meetings were held, one with eighth-, one with seventh-, and one with sixth-grade students who were identified as at risk. These students were given further explanation of the CHIPs program and were encouraged to take part voluntarily. Students who came for assistance signed an attendance sheet each day that they were present. The experimental group was defined as those who attended 36 of the 72 sessions. All other students would be assigned to the control group. It was also at this time that GPA's were figured from official school records on all of these identified at risk students. These scores would be used as a pre-evaluative measure at the end of the program.

Since all students are bussed to the school site, it is often quite difficult to have students stay after school for help. In addition, extra-curricular activities which take place after school also compete for times which might be good for a peer tutoring program. It is for this reason that the times selected for the tutoring process were as soon as the students arrived at school in the morning.

Each day, Tuesday through Friday, students attended the tutoring sessions from the time they arrived at school until the homeroom period was over. This was generally a period of around 30 minutes. Tutors helped students with homework assignments, various projects, and in studying for tests. An attempt was made for sessions to be of same-grade status, but since this was not always possible, there were times that an eighth grader would be helping a sixth grader in a cross-age tutoring situation. There were never times when a student of a lower grade helped a student of a higher grade. As tutees came in for help, tutors who were not helping another would go up to the tutee and ask what they could help them with. For the most part, tutors were expected to take the initiative for pairing up once the tutee had entered the room.
For the entire time of the tutoring sessions, there were from one to three faculty supervisors present. Supervisors took a minimal role in the operation of the tutoring process, allowing the program to be student-run as much as was feasible at this age level.

This study began at the beginning of the second semester in January, 1966, and ended at the end of the second semester in May, 1966, for a period of time totaling 18 weeks. The tutoring sessions began each morning, Tuesday through Friday, at 8:00 a.m., or whenever students arrived on their bus. Tutees were asked to come directly from their busses to the tutoring lab and were to stay until 8:40 a.m. Since the time between 8:20 - 8:45 is a study/homeroom period for all junior high students, no student would be missing any instructional time by coming to the lab.

**Data Gathering**

To begin the gathering of data, letter grades found on the grade cards at the end of the first semester were assigned numeric values. These values were in keeping with student handbook guidelines. The following table lists the numerical values assigned to each letter grade:
Table 3.1

**Numerical Values of Letter Grades**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>C+</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>B-</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F+</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D+</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three t-tests were conducted on statistics from this study. In the first test, students' GPA's in both groups, both experimental and control, were analyzed to find the level of differences in pre-program grade point averages. After the 18-week tutoring program was ended, a t-test was run comparing the end of year GPA's of the experimental group with the end of year GPA's from the control group. A third t-test was run to determine the nature of the difference in the two groups of scores. A probability of .05 was considered as adequate in attributing any differences reported in this study.
CHAPTER FOUR

Summary of the Findings

The following table will detail the statistical findings as indicated on report card grades. Pre-test grades were those gathered at the end of the first semester, and post-test grades were gathered at the end of the second semester. Raw scores are rank-ordered from highest to lowest levels of improvement and are separated into experimental and control groupings.

Table 4.1

Experimental Group Raw Score Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stu. # and Gr.</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Pre-Test</th>
<th>Post-Test</th>
<th>Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11 6th</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 6th</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 8th</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 6th</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 6th</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 6th</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 8th</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 6th</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 6th</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 6th</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 6th</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 6th</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 6th</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 6th</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stu. # and Gr.</td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Pre-Test</td>
<td>Post-Test</td>
<td>Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 6th</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 6th</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 6th</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 6th</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 6th</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 6th</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 6th</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 6th</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>-0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 6th</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 6th</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>-0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 6th</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>-0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 6th</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>-0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 6th</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>-0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 6th</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>-0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 8th</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>-1.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2

**Control Group Raw Score Data**
<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>8th</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>8th</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>7th</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>8th</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>8th</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>8th</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>8th</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>8th</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>2.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>8th</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>8th</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>8th</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>2.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>8th</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>8th</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>8th</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>8th</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>8th</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>8th</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>8th</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>8th</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>8th</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>7th</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7th</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>2.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>7th</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>3.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>8th</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>8th</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>8th</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7th</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cumberland Helpers in Partnerships**
At the end of the first semester of study, a t-test was run on all at risk students to establish a base mean GPA for each of the two groups. The control group (N=49) had a mean score of 2.14 on a five point scale. The experimental group (N=29) had a mean score of 1.93 on a five point scale. A .05 level of significance was assumed on a two-tailed t-test which was run on these pre-test scores. Scores were analyzed to find a t-score of .41.
This was found to be not significant at the .05 level. Therefore, it can be assumed that the control and experimental groups did not have significantly different GPA's prior to the beginning of the peer tutoring program.

At the end of the second semester, official school records were again examined to determine students' GPA's at the completion of the CHIPS tutoring program. The mean score for the control group at this time was 2.34 on a five point scale, and the mean score for the experimental group was 1.87. These scores indicate to this researcher that at the end of the 18-week tutoring program, the control group, after receiving little or no help from the CHIPS tutoring program, made higher academic gains as indicated by report card grades than did the experimental group. Additionally, data shows that the experimental group not only registered no level of improvement, but in fact, regressed as far as report card grades indicated. Possible reasons for this occurrence will be discussed in detail in Chapter Four.

The following table will detail the pre-and post-test mean scores for both experimental and control groups. Levels of improvement will also be given.

Table 4.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$\bar{X}_c$</th>
<th>$\bar{X}_e$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pre-tutoring scores</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>2.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>post-tutoring scores</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>level of improvement</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Scores based on a five-point scale.
In analyzing the levels of improvement experienced by the two groups, a t-score of 1.69 was indicated when comparing the mean scores of the two groups. This was found to be not significant at the .05 level. With no significant improvement indicated by the experimental group as compared with the control group, this researcher concludes that both null hypotheses, A and B, can be accepted.
CHAPTER FIVE
Conclusions

After receiving at least 36 sessions of peer tutoring, the experimental group registered no statistically significant gains in GPA scores as recorded on report cards. There are several items of interest concerning the results of this program which should be noted at this time. In addition, there is some rationalization as to why this program of peer tutoring yielded the results that were indicated by the scores.

The raw data scores indicate that twelve of the students in the experimental group registered improvement in their GPA scores. For the benefit of those students, the program did prove valuable and worthwhile. The scores showed that though a statistical majority of the experimental group registered a decrease in their GPA, there was a population for which the program facilitated their GPA scores either remaining the same or registering a gain.

There are certain time factors which seemed to have an impact on the working of the CHIPS program. Since the students were not able to enter the tutoring lab until they arrived on the busses, both tutors and tutees were totally dependent on the bus schedules. If busses happened to be running late, that meant that the students were late in getting to the lab that day. When the operation times of the lab has been set according to the class schedules, there is little room here for flexibility. If the time frames for the tutoring program were after school and for a longer period of time, indications are that there would be fewer interruptions and a more consistent arrival and departure time. Perhaps more success would have been registered by the experimental group if both the individual daily sessions were longer, and if students were required to attend 75 percent of the sessions to be considered as part of the experimental group.
Another interesting aspect of this program relates to the population of the two groups and the time frame of the tutoring program. At Cumberland Elementary and Junior High School, only the seventh and eighth grade students are eligible for the school sponsored winter sports teams. Basketball and volleyball run from January until March. Beginning in March, the students begin their track sports events. The sixth grade students are eligible for track, but historically there have been minimum numbers of sixth grade participants on the roster. According to the IESA (Illinois Elementary School Association) standards and standards set by our school, students must exhibit passing grades throughout the grading period to be considered eligible for the teams. A eligibility report of a "D" would place the student on watch for a week until grades are refigured. Since athlete's eligibility grades are taken weekly from the teachers, seventh and eighth grade students have not only a higher degree of motivation for maintaining good grades, but have a clearer indication during sports seasons of how they are performing academically in the classroom. In examination of the rosters of both the experimental and control groups, it was found that the experimental group, registering lower levels of improvement, was composed of 90 percent sixth grade students and the control group, registering a higher level of improvement, was composed of two percent sixth grade students.

Since the control group scored higher gains on the average, and since that group was composed primarily of 7th and 8th grade students, indications may be that the older students exhibit a higher degree of self-motivation when it comes to raising grades and academic achievement. It also could indicate that the 6th grade students were more easily persuaded to come in for extra help and felt less peer rejection in doing so. With the group working in the peer tutoring lab being mostly 6th graders, perhaps there was reluctance on the part of 7th and 8th graders to enter because of the stigma of that peer rejection.
In retrospect, a better approach to the tutoring program might have been to take special note of the Teacher's Survey in the section where teachers indicated that they felt that one of the main reasons for low achievement was disorganization and lack of study skills. With this in mind, an example of treating the problem rather than the symptom would be to introduce a program of study skills designed to aid the at-risk student in his/her overall classwork rather than to help with individual homework problems.

Though the CHIPs program did have 7th and 8th grade tutors available in the lab each day, most of the tutor population was made up of 6th graders. There is a definite difference between the attention span and dedication to purpose of a 6th grader as compared to 7th and 8th graders. The program may have benefited from enlisting more 7th and 8th grade tutors. Also, if the students had been separated into different rooms according to grade level for their tutoring, this may have proved beneficial. The room in which the tutoring lab was held each morning was also the computer lab. There were only twelve desks available, and when they were occupied, students had to sit at the computer terminals to work. Separating the grade levels for tutoring, then, might have proved beneficial in more than one respect; however, our school like many, has very little free space available and this proves to be a problem at times.

Throughout the program attempts were made to instigate parent interest in the tutoring program. There were public meetings, letters sent home, and press releases. Parent involvement is crucial to a child's education. There was very little parental involvement in any form in this program. How a parent responds to a child's academic achievement shows the value that that parent places on education.

Finally, one aspect of this project which cannot be dismissed is in the area of curriculum and evaluation. With all of the innovative methods of presenting information and assessing improvement, perhaps our educators need to examine this area in order to arrive at more contemporary methods of conducting our classrooms and evaluating levels of progress.
In summary, this CHiPs peer tutoring program helped 12 students to improve. For those other 17 who did not register improvements in their GPA's, there may have been benefits gained that were not measured by this study. Though it did not statistically prove to be a superior method of addressing the problem of low achievement for our at-risk students, it proved valuable as a remediation tool offered to students during parent/student/teacher conferences. Teachers and parents who did respond to the program expressed appreciation to having an additional system of remediation in place for assisting their students who were experiencing difficulties.
Appendix A
Teacher Survey

Teachers: In preparation for the meeting with at-risk parents which I will be conducting, I will need some information from you concerning your classes. Please take a moment to answer the following questions and get this form back to me as soon as possible.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you require your students to keep a notebook for your class?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you be willing to initial a student's assignment sheet each day in order to help parents to know what work their child has?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you generally available for conferences if parents call in?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you figure mid-quarter grades for all your students--and send them home?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you send progress charts home periodically?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indicate how often to above question ____________________________

Which do you consider the singlemost reason why students are failing in your class?
A. inability to do the work
B. excessive zeroes
C. poor organizational skills
D. continuing to hand in late work
E. other ____________________________

Could you be available to give extra help from 8:00 a.m. - 8:20 a.m. or from 3:25 p.m. - 3:45 p.m. for any student who would come to request it? |   |   |

Would you be willing to allow any CHIPs students in your first period class to work as tutors in the computer room during the homeroom period, 8:15 - 8:40? |   |   |

Would you be willing to allow any student who wishes tutoring services to be excused from your first period class during the homeroom period, 8:15 - 8:40? |   |   |

Name ____________________________________________________________
Subject & Grade Level _____________________________________________
Tutor Training for the CHIPS program will take place in ten 30-minute sessions. Training will be conducted by a certified staff member in coalition with a certified guidance counselor.

**Session I**  What is a peer tutoring program? Who should tutor?

This session should serve as an introductory lesson into the nuances of a peer tutoring program and what it entails. Brainstorming techniques should be utilized to help students to establish ownership in the beginning structure of the tutoring sessions.

**Session II**  Establishing Rapport.

This session will be devoted to methods of establishing rapport with tutees. The importance of developing sensitivity to the needs of others will be stressed. The differences between praise and put-downs will be discussed. Brainstorming examples of each will be an important part of this session. Reestablishing the purpose of the sessions will be in order here, as well as pointing out that a large part of whether tutees will return to further sessions will depend on the impressions gained from former sessions.
Session III. Attending.

This session will focus on attending on the part of the tutor and how important this is to the tutee. Role-playing will be utilized to model both positive and negative examples of attending. Eye contact, positive comments, unconditional regard, will all be modeled within the role-playing setting.

Session IV. Organizational Skills.

Organizational skills are essential to success in a student's educational career. Methods of helping a student to become better organized will be addressed. Brainstorming, role-playing, and questioning will all be methods used to gather information in helping one to become better organized. Strategies will be discussed which tutors may utilize to help diagnose disorganization. Reference to both Sessions II and III will be included in order to assist tutors in positive feedback to tutees.

Session V. Study Skills.

The need for superior study skills will be emphasized in this session. Techniques such as making sure students have all materials necessary for the tutoring session before it begins will be addressed. Planning study time and using the SQ3R method for studying will be a topic discussed in this session.
Session VI  Skimming Skills/Main Ideas.

Student tutors will have practice in recognizing main ideas and supporting details. Strategies for skimming to find information will be noted and discussed. Practice on these skills will be utilized during the session. Emphasis during this session will be not to find answers for tutees, but to help tutees to establish these skills for themselves.

Session VII  Critical Thinking Skills.

During this session the difference between factual questions and questions which require a greater depth of understanding will be explored. The difference between fact and opinion will be discussed. Guided practice on distinguishing between fact and opinion will be a part of this session. Logical reasoning and evaluation on opinions will be addressed. Practice on various questioning techniques will be initiated. Students may work in pairs to drill each other on effective questioning methods.

Session VIII  Summarizing and Sequencing.

The importance of summarizing text will be emphasized in this session. Methods of sequencing will be addressed. Separating main topics from lesser ideas will be practiced. Disregarding irrelevant material will also be a focus in this session.
**Session IX** Recognizing Deficits

Recognizing deficits in a student's study habits or organizational skills which are inhibiting progress in academic success will be addressed in this session. Emphasis will be on positive reinforcement rather than critical judgments. The following listening skills will be critically examined: listening to directions, listening critically, listening for main ideas, listening for speaker's purpose, importance of not interrupting. Role-playing will be utilized here to emphasize both positive as well as negative tutoring sessions and the effects of each on the tutee.

**Session X** CHiPs Ambassadors.

This session will be intended as a summation of Sessions I through IX. A focus will be on tutor attitudes, and acceptance of others will be stressed. Ways of being an ambassador for the program and a positive example for others to follow will be discussed. Brainstorming ideas will again be utilized in order to give responsibilities of ownership in the program to the tutors.
Appendix C

Parent Survey

Please take a moment to fill out the following questionnaire. No names, please.

1. Who has attended this meeting?
   A. Mother
   B. Father
   C. Both parents
   D. Other (Specify) __________________

2. Has your child had a history of low academic achievement?
   A. Yes
   B. No

3. What strategies have you enacted at home to help your child academically?
   A. I'm not sure what to do to help
   B. instituted an assignment sheet
   C. checked assignments nightly
   D. contacted teachers
   E. other (specify) __________________

4. How often in the last year have you met with your child's teachers concerning his/her academics?
   A. none
   B. 1-2 times
   C. 3-4 times
   D. more than 4 times

5. What keeps you from contacting your child's teachers about your child's grades?
   A. nothing--I feel very comfortable in contacting the teachers
   B. my work schedule is too confining
   C. I feel it's my fault that my child is making low grades
   D. I don't know what to ask
   E. I don't understand how they do their work nowadays

6. Which statement most typifies your feelings?
   A. I'm willing to help at home if I knew what to do
   B. I'm at the end of my rope with my child
   C. I feel it's a problem which should be dealt with at school
   D. other (specify) __________________

7. How do you feel about retention in the same grade at the jr. high level?
   A. I don't think Jr. high students should be retained
   B. I think they should be retained if grades are not passing
Appendix D

How to Help Your Child Succeed With Homework
(Canter & Hausner, 1987)

**Homework is the key link between home and school--how you respond**
to homework communicates to your children the importance you place
on education.

**Goals for our students:**

1) do all homework
2) work independently with minimal help
3) motivate students to do homework to the best of their ability

**Six simple steps to homework success:**

1) Clearly communicate to children our expectations that homework is to be completed.
   a) homework is top priority
   b) teach how to do homework/study skills

2) Set up daily homework time.
   a) habit of regularly scheduled time each night
   b) budget how much time
   c) during study times--no TV, Nintendo, phone calls
   d) quiet environment for studying
   e) establish study area/no distractions

3) Monitor and check to make sure they do all homework.
   a) look at their completed work
   b) students must bring home completed and uncompleted work

4) If students do their work, recognize and encourage their efforts/provide positive support.
   a) each night recognize something positive

5) If the four previous steps don't work, back up words with actions.
   a) determine student's capabilities by speaking with teacher
   b) ineffective actions--begging, pleading, anger, punishment
   c) effective actions--give students a choice, must do homework before receiving any privileges
d) give responsibility of completing homework to child

e) stand ground consistently/follow through

6) When needed, work with teachers
   a) stay in touch/daily assignment sheets
   b) completed homework comes home, compared with assignment sheet
   c) teamwork between parents and teachers
   d) you must know what is going on to be an effective parent
   e) support teachers' efforts in order to help your child succeed

**You are capable of helping your child achieve more academic success in school**
Appendix E

Daily Assignment Sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Teacher's Initials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject Area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments: __________________________________________

______________________________
parent's signature
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