

2006

# Parent Satisfaction with Marshall University's Summer Enrichment Program: Year Three

Cristen C. Pulliam

Follow this and additional works at: <http://mds.marshall.edu/etd>

 Part of the [Educational Assessment, Evaluation, and Research Commons](#), [School Psychology Commons](#), and the [Social Statistics Commons](#)

---

## Recommended Citation

Pulliam, Cristen C., "Parent Satisfaction with Marshall University's Summer Enrichment Program: Year Three" (2006). *Theses, Dissertations and Capstones*. Paper 793.

Parent Satisfaction with Marshall University's Summer Enrichment Program:  
Year Three

By Cristen C. Pulliam

Thesis Submitted to  
Marshall University Graduate College

In partial fulfillment of the  
requirements for the degree  
of Educational Specialist in  
School Psychology

Stephen O'Keefe, Ph.D., Chairperson  
Sandra Stroebel, Ph.D.  
Joyce Meikamp, Ph. D.

May 2006

### **Abstract**

The current study sought to examine the level of parent satisfaction with an extended school year program, the Marshall University Graduate College Summer Enrichment Program, verses the level of parent satisfaction at students' local schools. The study also replicated the findings in two previous studies (Lattimore, 2003; Wartenburg, 2005). Parent satisfaction data were collected using satisfaction surveys. A survey was mailed to parents at the end of the regular school year to assess level of parent satisfaction with local school (N= 105). Twenty surveys were returned by mail. Intercorrelations of the parent satisfaction survey questions for the local school were made with the original satisfaction measure on question 14. Ten significant correlations were made at the .001 level and were used to develop the new parent satisfaction with local school measure. The average score for the level of parent satisfaction with the students' local school was 3.85 (SD= 1.29). A second survey was mailed the week after the summer program concluded to assess the level of parent satisfaction with the MUGC Summer Enrichment Program (N=105). Twenty-one were returned by mail. Intercorrelations of the parent satisfaction survey questions for the MUGC Summer Enrichment Program were made with the original satisfaction measure on question 14. Ten significant correlations were made at the .001 level and were used to develop the new parent satisfaction with the MUGC Summer Enrichment Program measure. The average score for the overall level of parent satisfaction with the MUCG Summer Enrichment program of 4.68 (SD= 0.67).

A t-test analysis on the twenty returned parent surveys found that the variable #10 (My child was safe at school) was the best indicator of parent satisfaction with the local school and that

the variable #10 (My child was safe at school) was the best indicator of the parent satisfaction with the MUGC Summer Enrichment Program.

On the basis of self-report, the 41 responses from the 2005 surveys were combined and assigned to three groups, no involvement, giving and receiving information, and having control over decisions. An ANOVA was performed on the returned parent surveys found that parents who had medium participation (giving and receiving information) in the summer program had high satisfaction with their school program and parents who had medium participation (giving and receiving information) in the summer program had high with the MUGC Summer Enrichment Program. Overall, this analysis found that parents who had some level of involvement were more satisfied than parents who had less involvement.

Additionally, the level of parent satisfaction with the MUGC Summer Enrichment Program throughout the past three years was compared by using a 3x3 Chi Square analysis of categorical variables for question 14 (“I am satisfied with the MUGC Summer Enrichment Program”). Data found that overall level of parent satisfaction with the MUGC Summer Enrichment Program increased throughout the past three years of the program. Satisfaction levels were also higher with the chosen program (MUGC Summer Enrichment Program satisfaction Mean 4.68; SD 0.67) than with the mandatory local program (Local School Mean 3.85; SD 1.29).

### **Acknowledgement**

I would like to thank all of the faculty, staff, graduate students, parents, and children who participated in the 2004 MUGC Summer Enrichment Program. Each person helped to create a diverse learning environment where several learning opportunities could be provided. Thank you to the professors who provided this opportunity to work in a unique setting where children could be offered a variety of enrichment activities in an environment with several levels of support staff. Thank you to Dunbar Intermediate for allowing the MUGC program to use the facility and for being so helpful and receptive in participating in the program. Finally, I would like to thank my family for supporting me through this program and for being my pillar of strength when I was struggling to stand on my own. All of you have taught me to have confidence in myself and helped me to have the determination I needed to complete this graduate program.

<b>Abstract</b> .....	2-3
<b>Acknowledgement</b> .....	4
<b>Table of Contents</b> .....	5
<b>List of Tables</b> .....	6
<b>Chapter I</b>	
Introduction.....	7-8
<b>Chapter II</b>	
Review of the Literature.....	8-18
<i>Charter Schools and Parent Satisfaction</i> .....	8-9
<i>Involvement, Influence, and Level of Satisfaction for Parents whom Chose Students' School</i> .....	10-12
<i>Program Evaluation: Involvement of Stakeholders</i> .....	12-13
<i>Extended School Year Programs and Levels of Parent Satisfaction</i> .....	13-15
<i>MUGC Program History and Description</i> .....	15-17
<i>MUGC Program Goals</i> .....	17-18
<i>Problem Statement and Research Goals</i> .....	18-18
<b>Chapter III</b>	
Methods.....	18-22
Statement of the Problem.....	18
<i>Participants</i> .....	19
<i>Instrumentation</i> .....	19
<i>Procedure</i> .....	19-22
<b>Chapter IV</b>	
Results .....	22-24
<b>Chapter V</b>	
Discussion .....	24-28
<b>References</b> .....	29-33
<b>Appendix A</b>	
<b>Appendix B</b>	
<b>Appendix C</b>	
<b>Tables</b>	
<b>Curriculum Vita</b>	

### List of Tables

Table I	Means and Standard Deviation of Parent Survey Questions for Local School (LS) (n=20) and Means and Standard Deviation of Parent Survey Questions for MUGC Summer Enrichment Program (MUGC) (n=21)
Table II	Open Response Questions of Parent Survey Questions for MUGC Summer Enrichment Program (N=21)
Table III	Intercorrelations of Parent Satisfaction Survey Questions for Local School and Satisfaction Question Fourteen (N=20)
Table IV	Intercorrelations of Parent Survey Questions for MUGC Summer Enrichment Program and Satisfaction Question 14 (N=21)
Table V	t-test for variable of best predictor of parent satisfaction with local school
Table VI	t-test for variable of best predictor of parent satisfaction with MUGC Summer Enrichment Program
Table VII	New Parent Satisfaction Score Mean and Standard Deviation of Parent Survey Questions for Local School; Score is Combined Variables with a Significant Correlation at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)
Table VIII	New Parent Satisfaction Score Mean and Standard Deviation of Parent Survey Questions MUGC Summer Enrichment Program; Score is Combined Variables with a Significant Correlation at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)
Table IX	ANOVA of MUGC Summer Enrichment Program Level of Parent Involvement and New Satisfaction Score Measure and Local School Level of Parent Involvement and New Satisfaction Score Measure
Table X	Mean, Standard Deviation, and Range of Parent Satisfaction Across Years and MUGC Summer Enrichment Program New Parent Satisfaction Score Measure

**Parent Satisfaction with Marshall University's Summer Enrichment Program:  
Year Three**

Limited research has been done in the area of program evaluation and levels of parent satisfaction with school based programs. Few studies have examined the relationships among satisfaction variables, mainly parent satisfaction with local schools and extended school programs. Further, Lattimore (2003) suggests, "most program evaluations that utilize parent satisfaction measures only provide descriptive statistics of the data, which are insufficient in describing parent satisfaction and its correlates."

As such, the purpose of the present study sought to examine the level of parent satisfaction with an extended school year program the Marshall University Graduate College Summer Enrichment Program, verses the level of parent satisfaction at students' local schools. The purpose of the study was to replicate and test findings found in the Lattimore study, "The Relationship Between Student Achievement and level of Parent Satisfaction in a Summer Enrichment Program" (Lattimore, 2003) and the Wartenburg study, "Parent Satisfaction in a Summer Enrichment Program Evaluation: Year Two" (Wartenburg, 2005).

In 2003, Lattimore found the variable "perceived care by staff toward children" was the best predictor of parent satisfaction. In addition, the study found that the levels of parent satisfaction, by both parents of students with disabilities and parents of students without disabilities, were unaffected by the variables of parent involvement and perceived student achievement.

In the study replicated by Wartenburg (2005), the variable "I would recommend the Summer Enrichment Program to other parents" was the best predictor of parent satisfaction. The study also found that parent satisfaction to be a complex variable that was influenced by multiple

factors; however, the study found that 70% of parent satisfaction was accounted for by the variables “I would recommend the program” and “teachers seemed to make learning exciting.”

The present study will evaluate the same variables used in the Lattimore and Wartenburg studies, to determine if findings can be replicated as suspected. Therefore, the study seeks to determine the following: 1) if parents experienced higher levels of satisfaction with summer enrichment program verses local school program, 2) if there is a significant relationship between level of parent involvement and level of parent satisfaction, 3) the predictor variables as indicators of parent satisfaction, and 4) if there is a positive progression of the level of parent satisfaction over the previous three years of the program.

### **Literature Review**

#### *Charter Schools and Parent Satisfaction*

School choice is central themes in today’s school movement whereas parents are choosing charter schools and magnet schools over the traditional public schools that student’s were previously enrolled. Finn Jr., C., Manno, B. V., Bierlein, L.A., & Vanourek, G. (1997) found that a large majority of parents felt that charter schools were better for their children with respect to class size, school size, teacher attentiveness, and the quality of instruction and curriculum. Higher levels of student satisfaction were indicated in the charter school system, including more satisfaction with teachers, class size, and curriculum. While students appear satisfied with schools that provide what they feel is a “quality education”, choice of schools is also a factor because “choice may increase satisfaction because it increases the ability of parents to match preferences for specific values, needs or pedagogical approaches with the school” (Schneider & Buckley, 2003, p.7). Further as Goldring and Shapira (1993) contend, “The family sovereignty position suggests choice leads to greater satisfaction in that it accommodates individual family preferences, mainly in the areas of curricula, teaching philosophy, and religion.

Parents will be satisfied in exercising their fundamental right of individual choice and freedom of belief about the best education for their children.” (p. 397).

Charter schools also are “designed to change the relationship between administrators, teachers, parents, and students” and has shown that for schools to be effective that “good interpersonal relations between members of the school community and shared beliefs and values combine to promote good teaching and a positive learning environment” (Schneider & Buckley, 2003). Choice in a school, in particular a charter school, also appears to empower parents as they make important decisions for students’ education. It also puts pressure on staff, teachers, and administration to provide students with a quality education. Additionally, parents and students may feel that the charter schools are better than the ones the students were previously enrolled as supported by Finn et al (1997) who found that a large majority of parents did note higher levels of satisfaction with the charter school, rather than the traditional school, with respect to class size, school size, teacher attentiveness, and quality of instruction and curriculum. Finn et al(1997) also found high levels of student satisfaction in the areas of teacher responsiveness, technology, class size, and curriculum. Further, teachers seemed to like working in a charter school and reported a higher level of overall satisfaction as compared to the traditional school (Koppick, 1998). Moreover, in 2000 Teske, et al. discussed the relevance of parent satisfaction noting that “charter schools cannot take their ‘customers’ for granted. Their very survival depends on the degree to which families believe the schools are responding to family preferences and working hard to provide the education they demand” (6).

#### *Involvement, Influence, and Level of Satisfaction for Parents whom Chose Students’ School*

Erickson (1986) argues that the simple act of selecting a student’s school may increase the level of satisfaction. For example, he notes that parents “who actively choose the schools

which their children attend, from a variety of options, seem far more satisfied with their schools than are parents who simply do the ‘normal’ thing with little thought” (Erickson, 1986: 105; also see Goldring and Shapira, 1993). Erickson (1986) further notes that when parents invest time and energy into making a choice about a school that they may be more satisfied simply as a means of justification due to the time, effort, and investment of resources (i.e. gathering information about the school, participating in enrollment, etc.), hence increasing satisfaction level with the parent’s choice of the student’s school.

In "Parent Involvement and Satisfaction in Magnet Schools: Do Reasons for Choice Matter?" , Charles Hausman and Ellen Goldring discuss parents views, roles, and level of satisfaction in the educational setting. Findings from the study noted that 1) parents selected magnet schools for many reasons and were highly satisfied with their chosen school, 2) their perceived influence over school decisions were important predictors of satisfaction with the school, and 3) their reasons for choice, perceived influence over school decisions, income, and distance from home to school significantly influenced their involvement at the school. Parents indicated that they based their choice of school on academics, values, and discipline and safety issues. It was also found that greater income was a predictor of parent involvement. Thus, parents chose schools based on their desire to enhance overall satisfaction of the students’ school. Further, research shows that “parents may be more satisfied simply as a result of having the choice option...this choice allows them to make rational, value based decisions, which further enhance satisfaction” (Hausman & Goldring, 2000).

Indeed, almost every study on parents level of satisfaction and choice of school found that parents did have a higher overall level of satisfaction with their student’s school if they were allowed to make the selection of the child’s educational placement (Moe 2001; Peterson 1998;

Witte, Bailey, and Thorn 1992; Schneider, Teske, Marschall 2000; Schneider, Marschall, Roch, & Teske 1999). Further, the choice of school may also be based on the preference of the child (who can be considered the natural consumer) which links to the level of parent satisfaction because as Coons and Sugarman (1978) and Levin (1991) suggests “families are usually in the best position to make decisions regarding children’s educational choices because they have the most intimate and extensive understanding of the needs of their children” and “families will more likely choose a school that offers a personal concern for the child” (52-53).

Parents’ level of satisfaction may also increase because parents with the opportunity of choice, parents are able to match their preference for values, students’ needs, and educational approaches used when working with the student. In increasing this “satisfaction match” between parents and the school, Goldring and Shapira noted that “choice leads to greater satisfaction in that it accommodates individual family preferences, mainly in the areas of curriculum, teaching philosophy, and religion. Parents will be satisfied in exercising their fundamental right of individual choice and freedom of belief about the best education for their children” (1993: 397).

Parents may also like being able to have a relationship with the administrators, teachers, and other parents at a charter school and may be able to create what Coleman (1988) refers to as a “functioning community within the school”. Further, these communities promote unity and appear to enhance the educational experience leading to more overall levels of parent and staff satisfaction (Driscoll, 1993). As such, choice of schools appears to empower parents while at the same time promoting a positive teaching and learning environment. Choice may also improve student-teacher relationships and students level of effort and motivation as Driscoll (1993) found that students who were able to have input in the selection of school “got along better with teachers because they felt that the teachers actually listened to them and praised them for trying

to participate and be a good student” (158). Additionally, Finn et al (1997) found that students who were able to have a choice in the school felt that the teachers did not allow students to fall behind in the curriculum, which additionally increased levels of parent satisfaction with the choice school.

*Program Evaluation: Involvement of Stakeholders*

When evaluating parent level of satisfaction, it is also important to consider the level of involvement of “stakeholders” who are instruments of change in keeping parents satisfied with schools educational and communicable level of involvement. Additionally, Wartenburg (2005) found in a review of educational studies that parent satisfaction had been influenced by the following: 1) parents feeling valued in the education process, 2) perceived level of student success, 3) levels of communication between staff, students, and parent, and 4) the parents own educational experience. As such, in order to change the level of parent satisfaction, there are numerous people who must take responsibility for the process. Some of these people, such as teachers and administrators, are essential to the change process; however, in a fortunate school district, school psychologists “must also accept the responsibility for promoting change and providing a broader range of services” (Batsch, 1992, p.2). Hence, some of the services a school psychologist could provide may involve indirect service, a scientific approach to school based problems, prevention, program evaluations, and working with a variety of stakeholder at various levels of involvement. For example, indirect service includes “consultation, research, program development for systems change, and in-service training” (Bradley-Johnson & Dean, 2000, p.2) and is done because “there are too many children and adolescents in need of services for school psychologists to work with them on a one-to-one basis; instead we must attempt to change the behavior of those who work with students daily” (Conoley & Gutkin, 1995, p. 210). School

psychologists can also play an important role in collecting the data that is needed for change. For example, Bradley-Johnson and Dean (2000) concluded that “it is the school psychologist who understands procedures for, and the importance of, systematic data collection and analysis, research design, and issues of reliability and validity measurement. These skills can be beneficial to both regular and special education in helping to plan more effective data-based programs, modify programs to fit particular situations and individuals, and objectively evaluate program effects” (p. 2). School psychologists can also be useful tools in change by providing program evaluation which can help provide information and insight into the development of new programs along with documenting its effects. Thus, “an understanding of procedures used in formative and summative evaluation is critical to ensure effective programs” and “skills in evaluation enable school psychologists to go beyond using a targeted skill level as the criterion for evaluating interventions to include consideration of both anticipated and unanticipated effects as well as input from multiple sources” (Bradley & Dean, 2000, p. 3).

#### *Extended School Year Programs and Levels of Parent Satisfaction*

Levels of parent satisfaction in summer enrichment programs were measured in a study of the Detroit Michigan public schools (1998). In this study, Green assessed changes in student achievement as measured by the Michigan Educational Assessment Program and the Metropolitan Achievement Test beginning in the summer of 1995 and concluding in the summer of 1997. In his study, 15 days of additional instruction were provided to elementary, middle, and high school level students and data was collected and analyzed to assess program effect. The following results were indicated: 1) the most positive achievement effect scores were found for fourth grade students, 2) 75% of the students and parents believed that the program increased the students’ skills, 3) 77% of parents wanted to see the program continue, and 4) 78% of the student

were not happy with the program. Recommendations for the program were to better define and improve program goals and strengthen parent involvement (<http://orders.edrs.com>).

In 1997, Johnson found that parents were pleased (85% of parents surveyed) to have his/her student enrolled in an extended school year program and felt that the program did help students to improve academic success. However, the study also found that only 77% of parents would re-enroll students in the extended school year the following year because parents felt that the extension “interfered with family vacation time” and that the buildings used did not provide adequate environmental setting where children could enjoy both “indoor and outdoor activities” (<http://orders.edrs.com>).

Additionally, levels of mathematics and reading performance were measured in a study involving extended school year students and those students who did not receive these services (New York City Board of Education, 2000). The study also examined the relationship between teacher certification and student academic performance in these school. Researchers found that “students in extended-time schools improved at a greater rate on city and state reading and mathematics assessments than did students in non-extended time schools in terms of increasing the percentage of meeting grade level standards and decreasing the percentage scoring in the lowest proficiency level on reading and mathematics tests” (<http://www.nycenet.edu>). Further, Lattimore (2003) noted that parent satisfaction increased with the amount of progress the student was able to make during the intervention process and indicated this to be supported by Upshur’s (1991) research that found a moderate correlation between the father’s level of satisfaction and the development of the child’s cognitive skills during an intervention process, such as extended school services.

As such, it appears that levels of parent satisfaction and achieved positive academic performance indicators are found to be essential components for providing an effective extended school year program. Hence, it becomes notably important to evaluate level of parental satisfaction relative to a students' local school and the students' extended school program. For example, in the literature, it has been noted that data regarding parent satisfaction, or dissatisfaction, can be used to improve, add, or eliminate programs (Upshur, 1991; Woler, 1987) and help increase levels of parental or organizational involvement which in turn strengthens and improves the extended school program (Bailey, 1987; Conn-Powers, Ross-Allen, & Holburn, 1990). Lattimore (2003) further noted that parent satisfaction with his/her own school aged child has a lot to do with the parent's personal experience along with school and other variables such as parent involvement with the child's school, teacher's attitudes regarding parents, transportation services, and other support services (Carnevale & Desrochers, 1999; Salisbury et al., 1997).

#### *MUGC Program History and Description*

The Marshall University Graduate Program began over 20 years ago in response to efforts to provide a hands-on training experience to a diverse population of graduate students including those enrolled in the areas of Leadership Studies, Special Education, Counseling, Psychology, and Reading. According to a Marshall University Press release (2001), a five-week summer enrichment program was offered for K-12 students as a way to bring children and educators together to provide a unique collaboration experience. The press release (2001) indicated that Dr. Joyce Meikamp explained that the summer enrichment program was "designed to offer our graduate students a clinical experience leading to certification or licensure while providing children an opportunity to participate in an activity-based learning experience." The

program was designed to provide a hands-on learning experience for children while offering developing teachers an opportunity to work with students in a small collaborative classroom setting. The cost of the program was made affordable, with breakfast and lunch provided, so that all students were able to attend. The director of the program and staff promoted the program by sending out brochures to county elementary, middle, and high schools; and, encouraged guidance counselors and parents to refer “at risk” students or those with additional special education needs.

In a 2003 press release, the summer enrichment program was announced with the theme, “West Virginia, It’s an Adventure.” During the five-week program, 80 graduate students participated in the program and offered several hands on activities such as “painting, cooking, measuring, and writing” with the addition of a segment of therapeutic drumming that was provided by Dr. Paula Bickam. In this press release, Dr. Meikamp noted that the “program gives our graduate students and school children a look at the real work while trying out new ideas.” Lattimore (2003) additionally noted further that the “program provides opportunities for parents to become acquainted with the type of education their child is receiving” such as offering topics of discussion in “stress management, learning styles, building self-esteem, and homework” and involving parents through parent conferences with a multidisciplinary team to discuss the child’s “behavior, attitude, development, academics, and family dynamics.”

Further, in 2005 the summer enrichment program was held again at Dunbar Intermediate School and offered graduate students the opportunity to work with a diverse population of students on integrated academics, reading, and developmental guidance activities. A 90-minute reading block was observed with pre and post measures of reading success evaluated. Additionally, parents were encouraged to participate in the program through parent informational

sessions, collaborative conferences, and pre and post surveys regarding satisfaction with the overall summer enrichment program.

### *MUGC Program Goals*

The MUGC Summer Enrichment Program set out to provide students with the opportunity to experience a diverse collaborative teaching model where students were offered a hands-on approach to learning. This collaborative teaching approach as Wartenburg (2005) points out encourages “teachers to work together to examine the challenges they face in the classroom, and then decide as a team of reflective, committed professionals how best to proceed” along with offering “educators the resources to provide individualized instruction that will benefit all students within an inclusion classroom” (p 2 & 3). Thus, the program offers a joint educational experience to teach a diverse population of students in an integrated setting. The program, as Wartenburg (2005) noted, additionally provided an activity-based approach to learning where “experiential learning is used in a way for children to interact with people, objects, and the environment in ways that have potential meaning to them.” In these activities, a theme is used “to help students construct and internalize information about a particular topic” (Wartenburg, 2005, p.4). The goals of the MUGC Summer Enrichment Program were to 1) offer graduate students a clinical experience leading to certification or licensure and 2) allow children to participate in a hands-on activity based integrated learning experience. Moreover, according to Lattimore (2003) “one of the main components for the success of the program was the high student/adult ratio” along with the classrooms that offered “multiage, multi-ability students to participate along with the full inclusion of students with special needs.” Lattimore (2003) also indicated that the program had previously been a success due to the implementation of a

collaborative team teaching model where students gained field experience in assisting children during the educational development while being supervised by the program's faculty.

### *Problem Statement and Research Goals*

There have been a limited amount of studies that have examined the relationship between parent satisfaction between local (or the student's home school) and the level of parental satisfaction with the extended school program. Moreover, there has been limited research on the variables involved (i.e. child's participation with the staff, perceived level of student enrichment, parent participation, and perceived level of students academic progress of achievement) as related to the level of parent satisfaction of the child's local school verses the extended school program. As such, this program evaluation of the 2005 MUGC Summer Enrichment Program seeks to examine the predictor variables of parental satisfaction and the differences between satisfaction levels of the local school and the extended school program.

## **Methods**

### *Statement of the Problem*

The present study will evaluate the same variables used in the Lattimore (2003) and Wartenburg (2004) study to see if the findings can be replicated. Hence, the present study seeks to determine the following: (1) intercorrelations between variables will be able to be combined to improve the satisfaction measure of question #14, (2) variables will be used as predictors of best measurement for level of parent satisfaction, (3) involvement and satisfaction; hypothesized is that involved parents will be more satisfied than uninvolved parents, (4) satisfaction across the years; hypothesized is that parent satisfaction will increase as the program improves, and (5) parent satisfaction with the summer school program will be compared with parent satisfaction with the school year program using a one tailed t-test of the satisfaction means; hypothesized is

that parents will be more satisfied with a program that they have chosen for his/her child to attend than with a mandatory local school program.

### *Participants*

Surveys were mailed out to parents of 105 students who participated in the Marshall University Graduate College Summer Enrichment Program. Of the surveys returned, twenty-one “parent satisfaction with local school” surveys were returned, while twenty “parent satisfaction with MUGC Summer Enrichment Program” surveys were returned.

### *Instrumentation*

The current study utilized the parent satisfaction survey that was used in the Lattimore study (Lattimore, 2003). It was reviewed and revised by the committee chair and committee members, one of whom was the director of the field experience MUGC Summer Enrichment Program. The surveys utilized a Likert scale format with the following levels: 1= strongly disagree, 2= disagree, 3= neutral, 4= agree, and 5= strongly agree. The parent surveys, both for the local school and the MUGC Summer Enrichment Program, were designed to elicit information on the following scales: perceived student progress, quality of staff, school climate, socialization, perception of the program, and level of parent involvement. Overall the surveys sought to explore the nature and level of parent satisfaction and involvement which were levels adapted from Lusthaus, Lusthaus, and Gibbs (1981) which were: (a) no involvement, (b) giving and receiving information, and (c) having control over decisions.

### *Procedure*

The parents of all 105 students were mailed a local school satisfaction survey the first week of the MUGC Summer Enrichment Program. A cover letter was attached to the survey explaining the purpose of the study and confidentiality. In addition, these surveys were coded to

protect identity. Returned, completed surveys served as written consent. A second set of surveys was mailed the week after the summer program concluded to assess the level of parent satisfaction with the MUGC Summer Enrichment Program (n=105). A cover letter was attached to the survey explaining the purpose of the study and confidentiality. These surveys were also coded to protect identity. The returned completed surveys served as written consent.

*Development of new satisfaction measures*

Of the 105 parent satisfaction with local schools surveys mailed, twenty were returned. Intercorrelations of the parent satisfaction survey questions for the local school were made with the original satisfaction measure on question 14 “I was satisfied with my child’s school this year”. Out of this survey, ten significant correlations were made at the .001 level with the original measure of question 14; the intercorrelations were then used to develop the new “parent satisfaction with local school measure”. This measure was now used in place of the single satisfaction measure of question 14 (see Table IV). New questions and intercorrelations for this measure included the following survey items: 1. I would like my child to attend the same school for the following year ( $r=.747$ ), 2. I would recommend my child’s school to another parent. ( $r=.849$ ), 3. My child has improved his/her ability to get along with others ( $r=.620$ ), 4. My child enjoyed school this year ( $r=.863$ ), 6. I am pleased with how the teachers worked with my child this school year ( $r=.621$ ), 7. My child has benefited from school this year (.690), 8. My child’s teacher’s seemed to make learning exciting and fun ( $r=.807$ ), 10. My child was safe at school ( $r=.671$ ), 11. Teachers and staff took prompt action when problems occur ( $r=.764$ ), and 14. I was satisfied with my child’s school this year ( $r=1.0$ ). The average score for the level of parent satisfaction with the students’ local school was 3.85 (SD= 1.29). As can be seen, the strongest correlations with the original question 14 were seen in items 2, 4, and 8. A second survey was

mailed the week after the summer program concluded to assess the level of parent satisfaction with the MUGC Summer Enrichment Program (N=105). Out of this survey, twenty-one surveys were returned. Intercorrelations of the parent satisfaction survey questions for the MUGC Summer Enrichment Program were made with the original satisfaction measure on question 14 “I am satisfied with the MUGC Summer Enrichment Program”. Ten significant correlations were made at the .001 level with the original measure of question 14; the intercorrelations were then used to develop the new “parent satisfaction with the MUGC Summer Enrichment Program” measure (see Table V). New questions and intercorrelations for this measure included the following survey items: 1. I would like my child to attend the Summer Enrichment Program again ( $r=.679$ ), 5. My child made new friends through the program ( $r=.840$ ), 6. I am pleased with how the staff worked with my child during the program ( $r=.808$ ), 7. My child has benefited from the program ( $r=.634$ ), 8. My child’s teachers seemed to make learning exciting and fun ( $r=.693$ ), 9. The staff at the program truly cared about my child ( $r=.615$ ), 10. My child was safe at the school program ( $r=.905$ ), 11. Staff takes prompt action when problems occur ( $r=.886$ ), 12. Staff is willing to talk to me if I have any concerns/suggestions ( $r=.808$ ), and, 14. I am satisfied with the MUGC Summer Enrichment program ( $r=1.0$ ). The average score for the overall level of parent satisfaction with the MUCG Summer Enrichment program was a mean of 4.68 (SD= 0.67). As can be seen, the strongest correlations were seen on items 5, 6, 10, 11, and 12. The mean parent satisfaction score on question 14 was 4.5 (SD= 0.81) in the Wartenburg study as compared to a mean score of 4.4 (SD=0.84) in the Lattimore study.

Further, on the basis of self-report, the 41 responses from both the 2005 surveys (parent satisfaction with local school and parent satisfaction with the MUGC program) were combined

and assigned to three groups, no involvement, giving and receiving information, and having control over decisions.

**Results**

Results indicated that parents experienced higher levels of satisfaction with the MUGC Summer Enrichment Program (Mean=4.68) than they did with his/her child’s local school program (Mean=3.85).

A significant relationship was also found between the level of parent involvement and level of parent satisfaction. A one-way ANOVA (see Table IX) was done to determine the significance of the difference between the means, while comparing more than one group, and resulted in an F value of 4.68 for the MUGC program and an F value of 3.85 for the local school.

Table IX. ANOVA of MUGC Summer Enrichment Program Level of Parent Involvement and New Satisfaction Score Measure and Local School Level of Parent Involvement and New Satisfaction Score Measure

	Level of Involvement	Level of Satisfaction
MUGC	Giving and Receiving Information	High (Mean= 4.68)
Local School	Giving and Receiving Information	High (Mean= 3.85)

\*Level of Involvement= No Involvement, Giving and Receiving Information, Having Control Over Decisions

\*Level of Satisfaction= High, Medium, Low

Thus, the ANOVA on the returned parent surveys found that parents who had medium participation (giving and receiving information) in the summer program had high satisfaction with their school program and parents who had medium participation (giving and receiving information) in the summer program had high with the MUGC Summer Enrichment Program.

Overall, this analysis found that parents who had some level of involvement were more satisfied than parents who had less involvement.

A t-test analysis (see Table V and Table VI) was performed on the survey items to measure for the characteristic variable of parent level of satisfaction. The difference in the characteristics between the groups of variables was then compared. It was found that on the twenty returned parent satisfaction with local school surveys found that variable #10 (My child was safe at school) was the best indicator of parent satisfaction with the local school; and, of the twenty-one surveys returned it was found that variable #10 (My child was safe at school) was also the best indicator of the parent satisfaction with the MUGC Summer Enrichment Program. However, in the Wartenburg study, question #2 (I would recommend the Summer Enrichment Program to other parents) and #8 (My child's teachers seemed to make learning exciting and fun) were the best predictors of parent satisfaction. Additionally, Lattimore identified question #9 (The staff at the program truly cared about my child) as the best predictor of parent satisfaction.

A Chi-Square (Table X) was performed to gather and test the degree of confidence for the hypothesis of parent satisfaction levels being increased over the years of the MUGC Summer Enrichment Program.

Table X. Mean, Standard Deviation, and Range of Parent Satisfaction Across Years and MUGC Summer Enrichment Program New Parent Satisfaction Score Measure

Year and Study	Frequency	Mean	SD	Range
2003 (Lattimore)	35	4.40	0.84	1 to 5
2004 (Wartenburg)	42	4.50	0.81	1 to 5
2005 (Pulliam)	21	4.68	0.67	1 to 5

\*p>.05

This test was used, because the data was categorical. Additionally, this cross-tabulation allowed the variables to be broken down to further suggest a relationship between the variables. Hence, the level of parent satisfaction with the MUGC Summer Enrichment Program throughout the past three years was compared by using a 3x3 Chi Square analysis of categorical variables for question 14 (“I am satisfied with the MUGC Summer Enrichment Program”). Data found that overall level of parent satisfaction with the MUGC Summer Enrichment Program increased throughout the past three years of the program. Satisfaction levels were also higher with the chosen program (MUGC Summer Enrichment Program satisfaction Mean 4.68; SD 0.67) than with the mandatory local program (Local School Mean 3.85; SD 1.29).

### **Discussion**

The purpose of the study was to replicate and test findings found in the Lattimore study, “The Relationship Between Student Achievement and level of Parent Satisfaction in a Summer Enrichment Program” (Lattimore, 2003) and the Wartenburg study, “Parent Satisfaction in a Summer Enrichment Program Evaluation: Year Two” (Wartenburg, 2005). Present study findings reveal commonalities between the studies, such as: increased levels of parent satisfaction with the MUGC Summer Enrichment Program, participation and level of parent satisfaction, and variables used as predictor values for parent level of satisfaction. The level of parent satisfaction of all three studies has increased over the years and may be reflective of improved programming and school selection choice.

The differences between the studies were found as the different measures of variables used to predict parent satisfaction levels. The differences in these variables may have been due to programming development, participants surveyed, program structure, or other related variables. As such, a new parent satisfaction variable was created, in the current study, to

combine intercorrelated variables into one satisfaction variable that could be used to determine level of parent satisfaction. This variable was also created because many factors are involved when determining level of parent satisfaction. For instance, parents may be more satisfied if they choose a school that they feel will better prepare his/her child academically or socially, or they may have increased levels of satisfaction simply because they have the opportunity to make a choice about his/her child's education. Other factors that may contribute to the level of satisfaction may be teacher/ staff involvement, student/teacher ratio, meal planning, academic progress, or being able to feel that his/her child can be in a safe environment with staff who care about the students' health and well-being. As such, in both parent satisfaction surveys, variable #10 (My child was safe at school) was the number one predictor of parent satisfaction. This variable may be more pronounced due to the higher levels of school violence in the media and parents may want to be able to ensure a placement where they feel the child can be protected.

Weaknesses in this study included: 1) small response set, 2) response set was determined only by people who choose to complete the survey and may not have been the same people who completed each survey, and 3) possible response bias- overrating parent satisfaction on survey items. In order to decrease these weaknesses, a larger data set is needed for both survey sets. Parent satisfaction with the local school needs to be included in the pre-enrollment criteria so that all parents can be surveyed. An exit interview with the Summer Enrichment Program would also enhance the ability to collect more data from the parents. This would also allow parents individual responses to be compared between the two data sets, rather than using the data set in its entirety for an overall satisfaction value, to determine other variables that may influence level of parent satisfaction. Additionally, there were no variable used to determine levels of student satisfaction. This would be important to include based on research by Coons and Sugarman

(1978) and Levin (1991) which suggests “families are usually in the best position to make decisions regarding children’s educational choices because they have the most intimate and extensive understanding of the needs of their children” and further indicates that a student’s motivation and preference can be linked to levels of parent satisfaction.

*Recommendations and Implications for the Summer Enrichment Program*

Open response questions were also used to evaluate quality assurance and to help make suggestions for the overall general programming for the Summer Enrichment Program.

Responses indicated that parents liked the following about the program: 1) the program was fun and structured, 2) the staff was eager to see the kids, 3) the kids were able to develop friendships, and 4) the schedule was convenient for parents. This is supported by the findings of Coleman (1988) who indicated that parents do indeed like having a relationship with administrators, teachers, and other parents and being able to build an actual functional community within the school, such as the MUGC Summer Enrichment Program was able to provide. Overall, most parents reported that they “liked the program”; however, some noted that it was too short and that they had a long distance to travel to be able to have their child participate in the program. Parents also indicated that they would like to see the length of the program increase. In the previous study done by Wartenburg, the highest response to the open ended question “what I liked about the program the most was...” resulted in 42% of the parents noting that they enjoyed the consultations and concern provided by the staff. In this study, no response for weakness accounted for 74% of the measure, while lack of transportation (.05%), program too short (.05%), ineffective program (.05%), more student counseling (.05%), and other (.01%) accounted for the rest of the response data.

Recommendations and further study for the MUGC Summer Enrichment Program include the following: 1) Have parents complete the parent survey for the local school as a part of the enrollment process for attending the program, 2) When students exit the program, there should be some type of exit interview to gather more data about the reason for the exit and to gather information about the MUGC Summer Enrichment Program, 3) Students should be given the opportunity to complete surveys about his/her local school program and the MUGC Summer Enrichment Program to help enhance levels of student motivation and to allow them to take ownership in their progress in the program, 4) If the parents must complete and return surveys, students should be given some type of incentive to help ensure that parents return any information and/or survey forms, and 5) Data gathered from the parent and student surveys should be used to compare level of satisfaction of both the local and MUGC Summer Enrichment Programs and levels of student motivation or satisfaction should be compared to gains in academic achievement in the MUGC program.

Overall results indicated the following: 1) if parents were able to choose the school the child attended, they tended to be more satisfied with the school (i.e. parents were more satisfied with the MUGC Summer Enrichment Program than with the mandatory local school program), 2) a new predictor variable was used to determine the level of parent satisfaction for both the local school and MUGC Summer Enrichment Program and found more parents to be satisfied with the MUGC Summer Enrichment Program, 3) parents who were more involved with the education and decision making of the child were more satisfied with his/her child's overall educational experience, 4) the best predictor of parent satisfaction with the MUGC Summer Enrichment Program and local school was variable #10 (My child was safe at school), and 5) level of parent satisfaction has increased over the past three years of the program. Further, due

to new research findings and the new creation of the levels of satisfaction variable for both the parent satisfaction with local school and parent satisfaction with MUGC Summer Enrichment Program, more research needs to be done to support these findings and to help improve and enhance the MUGC Summer Enrichment Program.

### References

- Batche, G. M. (1992). School psychology and assessment: A future together? *Communique*, 20 (2).
- Bailey, D.B. (1997). Collaborative goal-setting with families: Resolving differences in values and priorities for service. *Topics in early Childhood Special Education*, 7 (2), 59-71.
- Bradley-Johnson, S. & Dean, V. J. (2000). Role change for school psychology: The challenge continues in the new millennium. *Psychology in the Schools*, 37 (1), 1- 5.
- Carnevale, A. P., & Desrochers, D. M. (1999). *School satisfaction: A statistical profile of cities and suburbs*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.
- Coleman, J. (1988). Social capital in the creation of human capital. *American Journal of Sociology*, 94, Supplement: S95-S120.
- Conoley, J.C. & Gutkin, T. B. (1995). Why didn't- why doesn't- school psychology realize its promise? *Journal of School Psychology*, 33, 209-218.
- Conn-Powers, M., C., Ross-Allen, J., & Holburn, S. (1990). Transition of young children into the elementary education mainstream. *Topics in Early Childhood Special Education*, 9(4), 91-105.
- Coons, J. & Sugarman, D. (1978). *Education by choice: The case for family control*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Driscoll, M. (1993). Choice, achievement, and school community. In *School Choice: Examining the Evidence*, edited by E. Russell and R. Rothstein. Washington, D.C.: Economic Policy Institute.
- Erickson, D. (1986). Choice and private schools: Dynamics of supply and demand. In *Private*

*Education: Studies in Choice and Public Policy*, edited by D.C. Levy. New York: Oxford University Press.

- Ferrebee, M. L. (2003). Program evaluation of practicum III: Marshall university's summer enrichment program from a school psychology student's perspective. Electronic thesis retrieved on June 16, 2005 from [http://www.marshall.edu/etd/masters/ferrebee-melissa-2003eds\[1\].pdf#search='MUGC%20Summer%20Enrichment%20Program'](http://www.marshall.edu/etd/masters/ferrebee-melissa-2003eds[1].pdf#search='MUGC%20Summer%20Enrichment%20Program')
- Finn Jr., C., Manno, B. V., Bierlein, L.A., & Vanourek, G. (1997). Charter schools in action: Final report, DC: Hudson Institute.
- Goldring, E.B. & Shapira, R. (1993). Choice, empowerment, and involvement: What satisfies parents? *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 15, 396-409.
- Green, C., (1998). The extended school year program consolidated report: Achievement test scores and survey findings. Detroit Public Schools, MI, Office of Research, Evaluation, and Testing. Website, retrieved on January 6, 2006: <http://orders.edrs.com>.
- Hausman, C. & Goldring, E. (2000). Parent involvement, influence, and satisfaction in magnet school: Do reasons for choice matter? *The Urban Review*, 32 (2), 105-121.
- Hite Jr., W. R. (2001). Extending the school year: Student achievement, attendance, and student, teacher, and parent satisfaction. Electronic dissertation retrieved on June 17, 2005 from <http://scholar.lib.vt.edu/theses/available/etd-11292001-175702/unrestricted/Front.pdf>
- Johnson, C., (1997). The extended school year program, parents' perceptions. Detroit Public Schools, MI, Office of Research, Evaluation, and Testing. Website, retrieved on December 28, 2005: <http://orders.edrs.com>.
- Koppich, J. (1998). New rules, new roles? The professional work and lives of charter school teachers. Washington DC: National Educational Association.

- Lattimore, R. F. (2003). The relationship between student achievement and level of parent satisfaction in a summer enrichment program. Electronic thesis retrieved on June 16, 2005 from <http://www.marshall.edu/etd/masters/lattimore-royna-2003-eds.pdf>
- Lusthaus, C. S., Lusthaus, E. W., Gibbs, H. (1981). Parents role in the decision process. *Exceptional children*, 48 (256-257).
- Mayes, K. (2001). Outreach Outlook, Vol. 1, Issue 4, June.
- New York City Board of Education, Division of Assessment and Accountability, (2000). Analysis of performance of extended-time and non-extended time SURR schools. Flash Research Report 2 and 3. Brooklyn, NY. Website, retrieved on January 6, 2006: <http://www.nycenet.edu>.
- Peterson, C.A. (2002). Reflections on the challenges of program evaluation. *Topics in Early Childhood Special Education*, 22 (2), 82-85.
- Salisbury, D. F., Branson, R. K., Altreche, W. I., Funk, F. F., & Boretzmann, S. M. (1997). *Educational Policy*, 11(3), 286-308.
- Schneider, M. & Buckley, J. (2003). Making the grade: Comparing DC charter schools to other DC public schools. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 25(2), 1-30. Retrieved June 16, 2005, from [http://www.focus-dccharter.org/background\\_issues/pdfs/makingthegrade.pdf#search='making%20the%20grade%20comparing%20dc%20charter%20schools'](http://www.focus-dccharter.org/background_issues/pdfs/makingthegrade.pdf#search='making%20the%20grade%20comparing%20dc%20charter%20schools')
- Schneider, M., Marschall, M., Roch, C., and Teske, P. (1999). Heuristics, low information rationality. And choosing public goods: Broken windows as shortcuts to information about school performance. *Urban Affairs review*, 34, 729-741.
- Schneider, M., Teske, P. & Marschall. (2000). Choosing schools: Consumer choice and the

- quality of American schools. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Somers, C. L. & Piliawsky, M. (2004). Drop-out prevention among urban African American adolescents: Program evaluation and practical implications. *Preventing School Failure*, 48 (3), 17-22.
- Teske, P., Schneider, M., Buckley, J., & Clark, S. (2000). Does competition from charter schools improve traditional public schools? Civic Report, 10. New York: NY, Manhattan Institute.
- Upshur, C. C. (1991). Mothers' and fathers' ratings of the benefits of early intervention services. *Journal of Early Intervention*, 15, 345-357.
- Wartenburg, K.M. (2005). Parent satisfaction in a summer enrichment program evaluation: Year two. Electronic thesis retrieved January 12, 2006 from <http://www.marshall.edu/etd/masters/campus/wartenburg-kim-2005-ma.pdf>
- Wellman, D. (2001). Marshall University Press Release (May). Marshall's summer enrichment program is scheduled. Huntington, West Virginia. Website, retrieved from Marshall University on January 7, 2006: [www.marshall.edu](http://www.marshall.edu)
- Wellman, D. (2003). Marshall University Press Release (May). Marshall's summer enrichment Program is scheduled June 23-July 24 at Dunbar intermediate school. Huntington, West Virginia. Website, retrieved from Marshall University on January 7, 2006: [www.marshall.edu](http://www.marshall.edu)
- Witte, J. F., Bailey, A.B. & Thorn, C. A. (1992). Second year report: Milwaukee Parental Choice Program. Madison: University of Wisconsin, Robert M. LaFollette Institute of Public Affairs.
- Woler, M. (1987). Program evaluation at the local level: Recommendations for improving

services. *Topics in early Childhood Special Education*, 7(2), 111-123.

## Appendix A

### Parent Satisfaction Survey with Local School Parent Letter

June 29, 2005

Dear Parent/ Guardian:

Would you please take a few minutes to complete and return the enclosed survey in the self-addressed stamped envelope included for your convenience? We are interested in your thoughts about the MUGC Summer 2005 Enrichment Program your child/children attended during the past school year. Eventually we want to compare your thoughts about your child's local school to MUGC's Summer 2005 Enrichment Program.

This information will be used for evaluation of MUGC's Summer 2005 Enrichment Program. It should be very valuable in providing feedback to staff and parents, as well as, planning for next year's program.

Your responses will be treated in a confidential manner. The program evaluator will only summarize the data; no names will appear with the data to be shared within Marshall University and/or included in any formal reports. Participation in this survey is completely voluntary. Please note you are free to decide not to participate in the survey, however, we hope you will take advantage of this opportunity to make suggestions or offer feedback.

Your time and thoughtful consideration are much appreciated. If you have any questions regarding the program evaluation, please contact either Dr. Stephen O'Keefe at (304)746-1937 or Dr. Joyce Meikamp at (304) 746-1983.

Thank you for your participation,

*Cristen Ferguson*

Cristen Ferguson  
School Psychology Student

*Joyce Meikamp*

Joyce Meikamp, Ed.D.  
Director of Clinical & Field-Based Experiences

**Appendix B**

## Parent Satisfaction With Local School Survey

Please circle your responses to the following questions. All responses will remain confidential. Your participation is greatly appreciated.

**1**=strongly disagree      **2** = disagree      **3**= neutral      **4**= agree      **5**= strongly agree

- |                                                                              |   |   |   |   |   |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. I would like my child to attend the same school for the following year.   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. I would recommend my child's school to another parent.                    | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3. My child has improved his/her ability to get along with others.           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4. My child enjoyed school this year.                                        | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5. My child made friends at school this year.                                | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 6. I am pleased with how the teachers worked with my child this school year. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 7. My child has benefited from school this year.                             | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 8. My child's teacher's seemed to make learning exciting and fun.            | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 9. My child's teacher's truly cared about my child.                          | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 10. My child was safe at school.                                             | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 11. Teachers and staff took prompt action when problems occur.               | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 12. Teachers were willing to talk to me if I had any concerns.               | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 13. I participated in some activities with my child at school.               | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 14. I was satisfied with my child's school this year.                        | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 15. I was aware of the events and activities for students and parents.       | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 16. I attended one of more activities/programs/events at my child's school.  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 17. Activities/programs at my child's school were helpful and informative.   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 18. My child made improvements in reading during the school year.            | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 19. I spoke with school staff and teachers about my child.                   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 20. My child received individual reading tutoring during the school year.    | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

**Appendix C**

Parent Survey for MUGC Summer Enrichment Program

Please circle your responses to the following questions. All responses will remain confidential and your effort is greatly appreciated.

**1**=strongly disagree      **2** = disagree      **3**= neutral      **4**= agree      **5**= strongly agree

- |                                                                              |   |   |   |   |   |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. I would like my child to attend the Summer Enrichment Program again.      | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. I would recommend the Summer Enrichment Program to other parents.         | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3. My child has improved his/her ability to get along with other children.   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4. My child enjoyed participating in the program.                            | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5. My child made new friends through the program.                            | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 6. I am pleased with how the staff worked with my child during the program.  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 7. My child has benefited from the program.                                  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 8. My child's teachers seemed to make learning exciting and fun.             | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 9. The staff at the program truly cared about my child.                      | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 10. My child was safe at the school program.                                 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 11. Staff takes prompt action when problems occur.                           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 12. Staff is willing to talk to me if I have any concerns/suggestions.       | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 13. I have participated in some activities with my child during the program. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 14. I am satisfied with the MUGC Summer Enrichment program.                  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 15. I was aware of the seminars for parents.                                 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 16. I attended one or more of the parent seminars.                           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 17. The parent seminars were helpful.                                        | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 18. My child made improvements in reading skills during the program.         | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 19. I have spoken with school staff about my child.                          | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

20. My child received individual reading tutoring at the summer program.                      Yes      No

21. Please circle how much academic progress you feel your child has made.

- 1= much less than the regular school year
- 2= less than the regular school year
- 3= the same as the regular school year
- 4= more than the regular school year
- 5= much more than the regular school year

22. Please indicate your level of involvement in the MUGC Summer Enrichment Program.

- 1= none
- 2= receiving information with staff
- 3= giving information to staff (i.e. phone calls, meeting with teachers)
- 4= giving and receiving information with staff
- 5= participating in decisions with staff

23. What I liked best about the program was \_\_\_\_\_

24. What I liked least about the program was \_\_\_\_\_

25. In order to improve the program, I would suggest \_\_\_\_\_

Table I

Means and Standard Deviation of Parent Survey Questions for Local School (LS) (n=20) and Means and Standard Deviation of Parent Survey Questions for MUGC Summer Enrichment Program (MUGC) (n=21)

Question	Mean (LS)	SD (LS)	Mean (MUGC)	SD (MUGC)
1.	3.85	1.5	4.50	0.88
2.	3.85	1.49	4.80	0.52
3.	3.75	1.01	4.15	0.93
4.	3.65	1.34	4.30	1.03
5.	4.25	0.78	4.65	0.67
6.	4.00	1.33	4.80	0.52
7.	3.90	1.20	4.55	0.82
8.	3.85	1.38	4.65	0.81
9.	4.15	1.18	4.80	0.52
10.	4.40	0.82	4.85	0.48
11.	3.75	1.37	4.45	0.99
12.	4.20	1.15	4.80	0.52
13.	3.40	1.04	3.25	1.65
14.	3.55	1.39	4.80	0.52
15.	3.95	1.14	4.65	0.93
16.	3.60	1.09	3.20	1.54
17.	3.75	0.91	3.80	1.36
18.	3.60	1.39	3.60	1.18
19.	4.30	1.03	3.95	1.46
20.	2.90	1.74	1.40	0.50

Table II

---

 Open Response Questions of Parent Survey Questions for MUGC Summer Enrichment Program (n=21)
 

---

Question	Frequency of Responses	Response Frequency
23. What I liked best about the program was...	13	Fun/ structured program 6 Staff eager to see kids 3 Kids made friends 2 Schedule 2
24. What I liked least about the program was...	13	I liked it all 6 Program was to short 3 Long travel distance 2 No evening seminars 1 Hands on activities 1
25. In order to improve the program, I would suggest...	5	Increase program length 5

Table III

Intercorrelations of Parent Satisfaction Survey Questions for Local School and Satisfaction Question Fourteen (n=20)

Question	Question 14
1. I would like my child to attend the same school for the following year.	.747**
2. I would recommend my child's school to another parent.	.849**
3. My child has improved his/her ability to get along with others.	.620**
4. My child enjoyed school this year.	.863**
5. My child made friends at school this year.	.348
6. I am pleased with how the teachers worked with my child this school year.	.621**
7. My child has benefited from school this year.	.690**
8. My child's teacher's seemed to make learning exciting and fun.	.807**
9. My child's teacher's truly cared about my child.	.554*
10. My child was safe at school.	.671**
11. Teachers and staff took prompt action when problems occur.	.764**
12. Teachers were willing to talk to me if I had any concerns.	.518*
13. I participated in some activities with my child at school.	.166
14. I was satisfied with my child's school this year.	1.00
15. I was aware of the events and activities for students and parents.	.347
16. I attended one of more activities/programs/events at my child's school.	-.055
17. Activities/programs at my child's school were helpful and informative.	.487*
18. My child made improvements in reading during the school year.	.499*
19. I spoke with school staff and teachers about my child.	-.084
20. My child received individual reading tutoring during the school year.	.348

\*\* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

\* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

Table IV

Intercorrelations of Parent Survey Questions for MUGC Summer Enrichment Program and Satisfaction Question Fourteen (n=21)

Question	Question 14
1. I would like my child to attend the Summer Enrichment Program again.	.679**
2. I would recommend the Summer Enrichment Program to other parents.	.423
3. My child has improved his/her ability to get along with other children.	.496*
4. My child enjoyed participating in the program.	.507*
5. My child made new friends through the program.	.840**
6. I am pleased with how the staff worked with my child during the program.	.808**
7. My child has benefited from the program.	.634**
8. My child's teachers seemed to make learning exciting and fun.	.693**
9. The staff at the program truly cared about my child.	.615**
10. My child was safe at the school program.	.905**
11. Staff takes prompt action when problems occur.	.886**
12. Staff is willing to talk to me if I have any concerns/suggestions.	.808**
13. I have participated in some activities with my child during the program.	.000
14. I am satisfied with the MUGC Summer Enrichment program.	1.00
15. I was aware of the seminars for parents.	.172
16. I attended one or more of the parent seminars.	-.013
17. The parent seminars were helpful.	.237
18. My child made improvements in reading skills during the program.	.457*
19. I have spoken with school staff about my child.	.192
20. My child received individual reading tutoring at the summer program.	.239
21. Please circle how much academic progress you feel your child has made.	-.080
22. Please indicate your level of involvement.	-.191

Table V

t-test for variable of best predictor of parent satisfaction with local school

Question #	N	Mean	SD	Std. Error Mean
1. I would like my child to attend the same school for the following year.	20	3.8500	1.5985 2	.35744
2. I would recommend my child's school to another parent.	20	3.8500	1.4964 9	.33462
3. My child has improved his/her ability to get along with others.	20	3.7500	1.0195 5	.22798
4. My child enjoyed school this year.	20	3.6500	1.3484 9	.30153
5. My child made friends at school this year.	20	4.2500	.78640	.17584
6. I am pleased with how the teachers worked with my child this school year.	20	4.0000	1.3377 1	.29912
7. My child has benefited from school this year.	20	3.9000	1.2096 1	.27048
8. My child's teacher's seemed to make learning exciting and fun.	20	3.8500	1.3869 7	.31014
9. My child's teacher's truly cared about my child.	20	4.1500	1.1821 0	.26433
10. My child was safe at school.	20	4.4000	.82078	.18353
11. Teachers and staff took prompt action when problems occur.	20	3.7500	1.3717 1	.30672
12. Teachers were willing to talk to me if I had any concerns.	20	4.2000	1.1516 6	.25752
13. I participated in some activities with my child at school.	20	3.4000	1.0463 0	.23396
14. I was satisfied with my child's school this year.	20	3.5500	1.3945 4	.31183
15. I was aware of the events and activities for students and parents.	20	3.9500	1.1459 3	.25624
16. I attended one of more activities/programs/events at my child's school.	20	3.6000	1.0954 5	.24495
17. Activities/programs at my child's school were helpful and informative.	20	3.7500	.91047	.20359
18. My child made improvements in reading during the school year.	20	3.6000	1.3917 0	.31119
19. I spoke with school staff and teachers about my child.	20	4.3000	1.0311 0	.23056
20. My child received individual reading tutoring during the school year.	20	2.9000	1.7441 6	.39001

Table VI

t-test for variable of best predictor of satisfaction with MUGC Summer Enrichment Program

Question #	N	Mean	SD	Std. Error Mean
1. I would like my child to attend the Summer Enrichment Program again.	20	4.5000	.88852	.19868
2. I would recommend the Summer Enrichment Program to other parents.	20	4.8000	.52315	.11698
3. My child has improved his/her ability to get along with other children.	20	4.1500	.93330	.20869
4. My child enjoyed participating in the program.	20	4.3000	1.03110	.23056
5. My child made new friends through the program.	20	4.6500	.67082	.15000
6. I am pleased with how the staff worked with my child during the program.	20	4.8000	.52315	.11698
7. My child has benefited from the program.	20	4.5500	.82558	.18460
8. My child's teachers seemed to make learning exciting and fun.	20	4.6500	.81273	.18173
9. The staff at the program truly cared about my child.	20	4.8000	.52315	.11698
10. My child was safe at the school program.	20	4.8500	.48936	.10942
11. Staff takes prompt action when problems occur.	20	4.4500	.99868	.22331
12. Staff is willing to talk to me if I have any concerns/suggestions.	20	4.8000	.52315	.11698
13. I have participated in some activities with my child during the program.	20	3.2500	1.65036	.36903
14. I am satisfied with the MUGC Summer Enrichment program	20	4.8000	.52315	.11698
15. I was aware of the seminars for parents.	20	4.6500	.93330	.20869
16. I attended one or more of the parent seminars.	20	3.2000	1.54238	.34489
17. The parent seminars were helpful.	20	3.8000	1.36111	.30435
18. My child made improvements in reading skills during the program.	20	3.6000	1.18766	.26557
19. I have spoken with school staff about my child.	20	3.9500	1.46808	.32827
20. My child received individual reading tutoring at the summer program.	20	2.8000	1.47256	.32927
21. Please circle how much academic progress you feel your child has made.	20	1.4000	.50262	.11239
22. Please indicate your level of involvement.	20	1.6500	1.66307	.37187

Table VII

New Parent Satisfaction Score Mean and Standard Deviation of Parent Survey Questions for Local School; Score is Combined Variables with a Significant Correlation at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

---

Questions used for New Satisfaction Score for Local School

---

1. I would like my child to attend the same school for the following year.
2. I would recommend my child's school to another parent.
3. My child has improved his/her ability to get along with others.
4. My child enjoyed school this year.
6. I am pleased with how the teachers worked with my child this school year.
7. My child has benefited from school this year.
8. My child's teacher's seemed to make learning exciting and fun.
10. My child was safe at school.
11. Teachers and staff took prompt action when problems occur.
14. I was satisfied with my child's school this year.

Combined Parent Satisfaction Mean  
3.85

Combined Parent Satisfaction Standard Deviation  
1.29

Table VIII

New Parent Satisfaction Score Mean and Standard Deviation of Parent Survey Questions MUGC Summer Enrichment Program; Score is Combined Variables with a Significant Correlation at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

---

Questions used for New Satisfaction Score for MUGC Summer Enrichment Program

---

1. I would like my child to attend the Summer Enrichment Program again.
5. My child made new friends through the program.
6. I am pleased with how the staff worked with my child during the program.
7. My child has benefited from the program.
8. My child’s teachers seemed to make learning exciting and fun.
9. The staff at the program truly cared about my child.
10. My child was safe at the school program.
11. Staff takes prompt action when problems occur.
12. Staff is willing to talk to me if I have any concerns/suggestions.
14. I am satisfied with the MUGC Summer Enrichment program.

Combined Parent Satisfaction Mean

4.68

Combined Parent Satisfaction Standard Deviation

0.67

## Curriculum Vita

### Cristen Pulliam

4642 Sherwood Dr., Ashland, KY 41101

Home Phone (606) 325-3312

E-mail [cristen81@yahoo.com](mailto:cristen81@yahoo.com)

#### Education

2003-current	Marshall University	Pursuing an Ed.S degree in School Psychology Pursuing a M.A. degree in Elementary Education Individual Plan for School Intervention (graduation for both May 2006)
1998-2000	Morehead State University	M.A. Clinical Psychology
1997-1998	Morehead State University	B.A. Psychology
1994-1996	Marshall University, WV	

#### Work Experience

09/19/05-06/05: Paid internship with the Wayne County Department of Education, Wayne County, WV. Experience includes assessment and report writing, SAT/eligibility meeting participation, case consultation, counseling (individual and group), behavior management planning for students and classrooms, curriculum based assessment, functional behavioral assessment, presenting family and parent trainings, crisis intervention, and implementation of developmental reading and social skills programs.

08/03-current: Pursuing a School Psychology (Ed.S) and Elementary Education School Intervention (M.A.) degrees full time at Marshall University. The program is based on the data-based problem solving model where opportunities are given to work within a school district applying the problem-solving process and designing research based interventions within a collaborative consultation model that embraces both direct and indirect service delivery. During the program students work closely with a mentor, work within the school system for 180 hours of practicum experience in a host school (Boyd County Middle School- 2004-2005 school year), have a 150 hour practicum experience in a summer school program (Dunbar, WV Intermediate-Summer 2005), and then complete the program with a capstone experience of a year long paid school psychology internship position (Wayne County, WV).

12/05/01- 09/16/05: Employed Full-time at Pathways, Inc. as a Mental Health Day Treatment therapist at Boyd County Middle School. Duties include providing group, individual, crisis intervention, community based interactions, and consultation services for middle school students (inclusive setting) who have behavioral and/or emotional needs that exceed that of a mainstream classroom. Goals are improving self-concept, social skills, decision-making skills, ability to identify others feelings and gain empathy, and increase consistency regarding management of every child's behaviors. Other duties included taking call for crisis-based services, providing behavior modification plans, curriculum based assessments, classroom observation, therapeutic recreation for chronically mentally ill individuals, psychological evaluations, court testimony, and providing out-patient services to youth.

08/01/00-4/17/01: Employed at Tri-State Neuropsychological Consulting as a supervised psychologist. Duties included neuropsychological assessment (including comprehensive evaluation, scoring, and report writing); individual adult psychotherapy for left neglect, cognitive

remediation therapy, memory retraining, independent living skills, and stress management; group and individual therapy providing services to children with brain injuries and neurological disorders; and evaluation, treatment, and staffing for in-patients at Health South Rehabilitation Hospital.

06/01/00-08/01/00: Internship at Tri-State Neuropsychological Consulting. Experience included 1200 hours of neuropsychological assessment working with both children and adults (i.e. brain injured persons, stroke patients, dementia, ADHD, etc.) in a professional private practice and in-patient hospital settings.

1999-2000: Graduate Teaching Assistantships in both Adult Assessment and Psychotherapy. Experience included reviewing student raw data for Rorschach, WAIS-III, MMPI-II, and MCMI-III protocols, along with teaching Adult Assessment and Psychotherapy labs.

1999-2000: Master's level practicum at Eastern Kentucky Correctional Complex (EKCC). Experience included 200 hours of group therapy with medium security inmates through the Violent Offender Program (VOP), and 600 hours of psychotherapy, psychological testing, and mental status evaluation of general population inmates.

Summer 2003-2005 Volunteered at the National Youth Sports Program (NYSP) Southern Campus as crisis and recreational counselor. This program was a comprehensive developmental and instructional sports program used to motivate youth to earn and learn self-respect through a program of sports instruction and competition.

#### **Memberships and Licensure**

Kentucky State Board of Psychology: Psychological Associate (license #0677- inactive status)  
West Virginia Gold Card Supervised Psychologist (license currently listed as inactive)  
West Virginia First Class Full-Time Permit 3800 School Psychologist, PK-AD, (license #8203)  
CPR certified by the American Red Cross (11/ 04)  
Certified in Safe (Physical) Crisis Management (11/ 04)  
Passed the Praxis II 0400 School Psychology (score 630)

#### **References**

**Dr. Joseph Wyatt, PhD:** Department of Psychology at Marshall University, Huntington, WV, 25755. Phone- (304) 696-2778. Previous supervisor (Professional reference)

**Tracy Spires, M.A.:** PSI Associates, Contracted with Adams County Schools as School Psychologist, Special Education Annex, 285 Lloyd Rd., West Union, Ohio, 45693. Phone: (937) 549-4373 or (937) 544-4116. (Personal reference)

**Lena Brown, M.A.:** Pathways, Inc., PO Box 790, Ashland, KY 41105. Phone: (606) 324-3005. (Previous employer).

**Elaine May:** Wayne County Department of Special Education, Supervisor, 212 North Court Street, Wayne, WV 25570, (304) 272-5116.

**R. Phawn Cusick, M.A., NASP:** Wayne County Department of Special Education, School Psychologist, 212 North Court Street, Wayne, WV 25570, (304) 272-5116 (Current Field Supervisor)