PN-ABG-584

Best available copy -- page 31 missing

PN-ABG-584

FILE

ISN = 69022
PN-ABG-584

COMPARISON OF SCHOOL RECORDS WITH PARENT'S INFORMATION ON ENROLLMENT, REPETITION, AND DROPOUT: A Field Study in Honduras

Ernesto Cuadra and Gerry Ewert
July 1987

Basic Research and Implementation in Developing Education Systems
(PROJECT BRIDGES)

A Cooperative Agreement Between Harvard University and the Office of Education, Bureau of Science and Technology with the Assistance of the Office of Development Resources, Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean. United States Agency for International Development. Project number DPE-5824-A-00-5076-00

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Background: In February 1986, the AID/LAC/DR/EST Bureau requested the Harvard University BRIDGES project to design a methodology and a microcomputer based simulation model to assist AID/Central America Field Missions in tracking progress on basic educational indicators. The model was tested in Belize, Costa Rico, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, and Panama. In all countries the model produced estimates of repetition that were higher than the official government estimates. The consistent difference between the model and government estimates was the basis for field research to evaluate the accuracy of information schools send to the Ministries of Education in these countries. Honduras was selected by the Latin American Bureau as the field research country.

Study Purpose: The purpose of this study was to determine whether the current Ministry of Education repetition status or BRIDGES age and grade based approach would provide the most reliable estimates of new students to grade level, repeaters, and dropouts in the Honduran educational system. The objective was to assess the accuracy of grade level enrollment, student repetition status, and student age records maintained by schools in Honduras. The accuracy of the basic grade, age, and repetition status data components at the local school level should indicate which data is most reliable for microcomputer based simulation. To guide the conduct of the study three basic research questions were posed:

1. How accurate are local school records of grade level enrollment?
2. How accurate are local school records of students' age by grade?
3. How accurate are local school records of repeaters by grade?

Methodology: Longitudinal data from 1983 to 1986 were collected on 327 students who had enrolled in Grade 1 for the first time in 1983. Three versions of the academic history of the sample cohort were reconstructed on the basis of school enrollment reports and interviews with parents. The students were drawn from 13 schools in two regions in Honduras selected as representative of schools in Honduras. The premise was that where parents' reports and school reports were congruent the school information was valid. Where the parents' reports and the school reports were not congruent the school information was considered not valid.

Data were collected from school records and interviews with school directors, teachers, and parents.

Results: The results of the study indicate that:

1. The school records of grade level enrollment are accurate based on an average correspondence per year of 93.5% between parent and school information;

2. The school records of student age by grade are accurate based on an average correspondence per year of 93.9% between parent and school information; and,

3. The school reports of repeaters by grade is not a valid reflection of the actual situation based on a high level of disagreement between school reported repeaters and parent information as presented in Table Ex.1 below.

Table Ex.1
Repeaters by Year 1984 to 1986

	REPORTED		PARENTS	
Year	Number	Percent1	Number	Percent1
1984	63	19.3%	144	44.0%
1985	46	14.1%	82	25.1%
1986	44	13.5%	79	24.2%

NOTE: 1. Percent of students repeating is computed as the number of repeaters over initial enrollment.

<u>Implications:</u> The major implications from the results of this study are that:

1. The school records on the number of repeaters enrolled by grade, used as the basis for reports sent to the Ministry of Education, are not accurate. The under-reporting of repetitions by grade results in the overestimation of new students to grade level and dropouts. The specific overestimation of dropouts due to schools under-reporting repeaters is contrasted with parent informattion in Table Ex.2 below.

Table Ex.2
Dropouts 1984 to 1986

	REPORTED		PARENTS	
Year	Number	Percent1	Number	Percent1
1984	92	28.1%	13	4.0%
1985	120	36.7%	27	8.3%
1986	152	46.5%	35	10.7%

NOTE: 1. Percent of students who dropout is computed as number of dropouts over initial enrollment.

2. The age information by grade that schools use as the basis of reports sent to the Ministry of Education

is substantially more accurate than status reports. These data are sufficiently accurate to support the use of an age/grade approach to estimating new students to grade level, repetitions, and dropouts.

Conclusion: This study provides only a preliminary assessment of the validity of the information on number of repeaters, enrollment by grade, and student age in the Honduran Ministry of Education data base. Student age and grade data is substantially more accurate than the repetition data. This strongly supports the use of an age/grade approach to calculating new students to grade level, repeaters, and dropouts. The inaccuracy of the repetition reports, through the under-reporting of the actual number of repeaters enrolled in each grade, indicates that relying on this data will produce an inaccurate picture of student flows in the Honduran educational system.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY i

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT vi

A. BACKGROUND 1

B. STUDY DESIGN 4
- Selection of the Sample 5
- Interviewers 7
- Conduct of the Study 8

C. RESULTS 9
- Definition of the term repeater 10
- Repeaters 11
- Dropouts 12
- Grade and Age 14

D. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS 14

APPENDIX A
DATA COLLECTION FORMS 17

APPENDIX B
MODEL AGE/GRADE METHODOLOGY 29

APPENDIX C
MINISTRY METHODOLOGY 30

APPENDIX D
COHORT ACADEMIC HISTORY 31

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1
Repetition Rates by Grade Estimated for 1983 3

Table 2
Estimated Number of Students Entering Grade 1 for the First Time 1979-1985 3

Table 3
Schools Included in the Study by Region, Location, and Size 7

Table 4
Student Sample by Gender, Area, and Region 9

Table 5
Total Sample Repeaters by Year 1983 to 1986 12

Table 6
Estimated and Reported Dropouts 1983 to 1986 13

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This study was a cooperative effort of BRIDGES, the Ministry of Education in Honduras, and the Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean of the United States Agency for International Development.

Valuable assistance in the design of the study, the coordination of the filed work, and the coding and preliminary analysis of the data was provided by Orlando Betancourth. José Roberto Martinez and Raul Munguia, from the Research Unit of the Ministry of Education, greatly assisted in the data collection, coding, and preliminary analysis of the data. Vilma Daysi Guillén, Sagrario Gaído, Estela Valentina Paz Bonilla, Herlinda Maribel Molina, Enrique Burgos, Darwing E. Guillén, Amadeo Juárez Osorio and Alejandro Arita, from the In-Service Teachers' Training Unit of the Ministry of Education, conducted the pilot test, assisted in redesigning the instruments for data collection, collected the data from schools, and conducted parent interviews.

Josefina Gamero, Director of the In-Service Teachers' Training Unit, Marco Tulio Mejia, from AID-Honduras, Omar Rousel, Liaison between the Ministry of Education and AID-Honduras, and Carleton Corrales, Director of the Teachers' College, generously gave of their time to discuss the first draft of the research design and gave valuable advice in the selection of the schools where the data were collected.

Ernesto Cuadra, the BRIDGES consultant in Honduras for the study, lead the research team and completed the data analysis.

A. BACKGROUND

In February 1986, the Education and Training Office of the AID's Latin American Bureau through a buy in to S & T/ED BRIDGES project [Basic Research Contract # DPE-5824-A-00-5076-00] requested Harvard University to design a methodology and a microcomputer based projection model to assist AID's Central America field missions. The specific purpose of the model was to track progress on basic educational indicators of cohort flows (such as numbers of promotions, new enrollments, repetitions, and dropouts) by region and by country. The model was tested in Belize, Costa Rico, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, and Panama. In all countries the model produced estimates of repetition that were higher than the official government estimates. The consistent difference between the model and government estimates was the basis for field research to evaluate the accuracy of information schools send to the Ministries of Education in these countries. Honduras was selected by the Latin American Bureau as the field research country.

In Honduras, local school officials report enrollment statistics to the Ministry of Education at the beginning, middle, and end of the school year. The statistics collected in March, at the beginning of the school year, are usually submitted to the Ministry by the end of April. These data are used as the basis for Ministry estimates of numbers of new students, repeating students, and dropouts for each grade.

Enrollment data are gathered at the local level from teacher class reports for each grade. Information includes grade, age, and the number of students repeating the grade. By subtracting total repeaters in each grade from grade enrollment the number of new entrants for each grade can be determined [New Entrants = Grade Enrollment - Repeaters]. A student "new" to a grade is defined as a student enrolled for the first time in that grade. For Grade 2 and above, these are typically students promoted from the previous grade. The number of students reported as dropouts from each grade is computed by subtracting the number of students enrolled as promoted and as repeaters from the previous years grade enrollment [Dropouts = Grade Enrollment previous year- Promoted to next grade - Repeaters of grade].

The Ministry's approach to computing the number of students reported as promoted and dropouts, relies on the validity of the number of repeaters data reported by each teacher in each school. An alternate approach to calculating the new students, repeaters, and dropouts at each grade level is an age/grade approach. The age/grade approach is a matrix which aligns students within each grade by age and relies on the accuracy of the grade and age data reported by each teacher in each school for each grade. These two approaches, the Ministry of Education based on grade enrollment and reported repetition data and the age/grade based on grade enrollment and age data, result in widely different

estimates of repetition rates by primary school level as shown in Table 1.

Table 1
Repetition Rates by Grade Estimated for 1983

Grade Level	Ministry Estimates	Model Estimates
First	27.3%	51.7%
Second	15.8%	34.6%
Third	12.1%	27.2
Fourth	8.8%	22.0%
Fifth	6.0%	14.3%
Sixth	2.0%	5.0%

The overestimation of dropouts and new entrants is the computational result of under-reporting repetitions based on the formulae for computing New Entrants and Dropouts. For example, Table 2 presents the estimated number of students entering Grade 1 for the first time by both the Ministry of Education repetition status and the BRIDGES age/grade approaches, and the estimated seven year old population, which is the legal school entrance age in Honduras, for 1979 to 1985.

Table 2
Estimated Number of Students Entering Grade 1 for the First Time
1979-1985

Year	7 Year Old Population Basel	Model Estimate	Ministry Estimate
1979	111,001	97,056	153,271
1980	114,821	97,508	154,905
1981	118,891	95,411	157,254
1982	123,191	120,102	170,983
1983	127,590	117,966	173,616
1984	131,920	119,482	179,977
1985	136,069	125,513	173,640

NOTE: 1. Population Projections Celade-Consuplane

B. STUDY DESIGN

The purpose of this study was to determine which approach, Ministry projection (based on reported grade and repeaters) or model projection (based on reported grade and age), provides the more accurate estimates of the actual number of new students, repeaters, and dropouts for each grade level. Determining the validity of the respective data sets would indicate which approach provides the best estimates of new entrants, repeaters, and dropouts in the Honduran educational system.

While both approaches use enrollment by grade as a basic starting point, the projection model age/grade approach disaggregates each grade enrollment into an age/grade matrix as a basis for tracking student flows in the system (see Appendix B for a detailed description of the age/grade methodolgy). The Ministry projection approach uses total enrollment and reported repeaters for each grade as the basis for tracking (see Appendix C for a detailed description of the Ministry methodology). Thus, the three critical data components are: 1. grade level enrollment; 2.

age by grade; and, 3. number of repeaters by grade.

In the study three research questions were posed:

1. How accurate are local school records of grade level enrollment?

2. How accurate are local school records of students' age by grade?

3. How accurate are local school records of repeaters by grade?

The research team reconstructed the academic history of a sample cohort of students. The history was based on data collected from school records and information given by mothers of the students in the sample. The sampled cohort were drawn from Grade 1 students entering school for the first time in 1983.

Previous research by McGinn and Davis (1969)(1) indicated that parents' reports of their child's academic history provide accurate educational information. Based on this research, information given by parents in this study was the criteria against which information gathered from school records was assessed. Where there is a high level of congruency between parent and school data, the school data can be accepted as accurate. Where there was a high level of disagreement between parent and school data, the school data can not be accepted as

---

1. McGinn, Noel F. and Davis, Russell G. Build a Mill, Build a City, Build a School. Industralization, Urbanization and Education in Ciudad Guyana. Cambridge, MA. MIT Press, 1969. pp. 106-120.

accurate. The specific comparisions are between parent and school reports of grade level enrollment, age, and grade repetition for each student.

Selection of the Sample: An ad hoc committee composed of representatives from AID-Honduras, the Director of the In-Service Teachers' Training Unit of the Ministry of Education, the Director of the Teachers' College (Escuela Superior del Profesorado), and the BRIDGES consultant selected regions which were considered by the Ministry to be representative of traditional and modern schools in Honduras. The regions selected for data collection were Catacamas, a traditional area in the south-west, and El Progreso, a more modern area in the north-east.[2]

The research team, with advice from Ministry staff, selected urban and rural schools in both regions. Three criteria were used in the selection: 1) a school must have had at least 30 students enrolled in first grade in 1983; 2) the school records from 1983 - 1986 must have a recorded names of repeaters; and, 3) the school records must be available for the entire 1983 - 1986 period. Table 3 lists the Grade I enrollment, estimated new entrants to Grade I, sample size, and sample as a percentage of new entrants for the 13 schools included in the study. Academic

---

2. The designations of "traditional" and "modern" were made by Ministry of Education officials.

histories were developed for 327 students from these schools' records and from parent's recollections.

Table 3
Schools, Grade I Enrollments, New Entrants, and Sample by Region, Location, and Size

Region	Name of School	Grade I Enrollment	New Entrants[1]	Sample	Sample %
Catacamas:					
Urban	Policarpo Melara	276	155	35	22.6%
	R. R. Andrade	69	39	33	85.4%
Rural	Pres. Centeno	110	62	35	56.8%
	A. G. Zelaya	32	23	23	100.0%
	Dion. Herrera	39	36	36	100.0%
	7 de Mayo	34	19	12	63.0%
	Total	560	333	174	52.3%
Progreso:					
Urban	J. T. Cabañas	243	136	32	23.5%
	San José	213	119	28	23.5%
Rural	José T. Reyes	120	67	30	44.6%
	Gral. F. Morazán	147	82	27	32.8%
	La Independencia	61	34	8	23.4%
	J. F. Kennedy	65	36	14	38.5%
	Luis A. Zúñiga	31	17	14	80.6%
	Total	880	493	153	31.0%
Total		1440	826	327	39.6%

Note: 1. New Entrants are estimated on the basis of Parent reported repetition rates for Grade I substantiated by an indepth review of Grade I records in two schools during sample selection.

Interviewers: Eight interviewers from the Training Unit of the Ministry of Education joined the Research Team to carry out the field work. All of them had been working as teacher trainers for at least four years in the Training Unit and had been primary school teachers. Some of them had been principals and

supervisors, and some had received or had completed course work towards a Master's Degree in Educational Administration. The interviewers' experience and professionalism were critical factors in gaining the cooperation of principals, teachers and parents. Interview schedules were developed and a matrix data collection form was developed to record individual student enrollment and status data. Appendix A contains copies of data collection forms used in the study.

Conduct of the Study: Interviews were carried out between September 22 and October 7, 1986. In both the Catacamas and Progreso regions the first contact was made by visiting the School District Supervisors responsible for the schools in the study. They were informed of the purpose of the study, the objectives of the research, and were asked for their assistance. In general the supervisors cooperated fully and in some cases they introduced the research team to the principals.

Home addresses of the students included in the study were usually obtained from the students themselves or classmates. School information and parental interviews were completed for 327 students in the 1983 sample cohort from Grade 1. The composition of the sample is presented in Table 4.

Table 4
Student Sample by Gender, Area, and Region

	REGION		TOTAL
Gender	Catacamas	Progreso	
Male	78	83	161
%	51.0	47.7	49.2
Female	75	91	166
%	49.0	52.3	50.8
Total	153	174	327
Area			
Rural	93	106	199
%	60.8	60.9	60.9
Urban	60	68	128
%	39.2	39.1	39.1
Total	153	174	327

School records were not always well organized or consistently kept. Student's names sometimes changed from year to year as well as from one enrollment record to another, and from the beginning of the school year to the final record at the end of the school year. This may indicate that teachers do not consider accurate record keeping a very important aspect of their duties. This attitude must have some effect on the accuracy of school enrollment records.

C. RESULTS

Based on information from interviews with teachers and school directors, and an examination of the enrollment records in the schools, a picture of the reporting process emerged. The enrollment report that teachers complete as students enroll at

the beginning of the school year in March contains the individual student's name, birthdate, address, and whether the student is a repeater. A copy of this report is sent to the School District Supervisor and the original is maintained in the school's files. Approximately a month after school begins the Ministry of Education sends to the schools the Initial Consolidated Enrollment Report. This report requests data on age and number of repeating students by grade level. Official proceedure calls for reporting to be completed on the basis of the school enrollment record. Toward the middle of the school year in June/July, the Final Consolidated Enrollment Report is completed by teachers and submitted to the Ministry, through the area supervisors, by school principals. At the end of the school year, in November/December, the student evaluations, which report promotions, failures, and names of students not evaluated, are completed by the classroom teacher and submitted to the Ministry by school principals through the respective district and provincial supervisors.

Definition of the term repeater: For the purposes of the parent and consecutive grade level reconstruction of the students academic histories, students are defined as repeaters when they enroll in a grade level equal to or less than they had been enrolled in the previous year. For the reconstruction based on school reported repetitions, student are defined as repeaters if school record data identified the student as a repeater in the

grade. The reasons for the repetition, such as failure or parental desire to retain the student, are ignored here since the purpose of this study is to assess the validity of enrollment reports in general and reports or repeaters specifically. In addition, students are defined as new entrants to a grade level if they are not identified as repeaters.

Officially, Article 136 of the Law of Evaluation states that students graded as non-satisfactory (0 to 40) fail the grade and must repeat the grade the following year. School teachers are required to ask for the school certificate, which reports the grade level the student has passed or failed, in order to enroll a student. However, a student who is enrolled in first grade does not need to show a certificate even if he/she attended the school the year before. The specific version of the officially mandated school record form, that schools must complete when recording student enrollment information, varies from school to school. For example some schools' forms: have a column to record repeating students and a separate column to record promoted students; others have only a column for identifying repeating students; while others have a column to identify repeating students by age.

Repeaters: Table 5 presents the total number of repeaters in the sample reported by all methodologies: (a) REPEATER - number of students reported in school records as repeating each grade from

1984 through 1986; (b) GRADE - tracking students by name through enrollment records for each grade from 1984 through 1986; (c) PARENT - parent recollections of child's grade level, attendance pattern, age, and grade repetition from 1984 through 1986. The data includes all students, regardless of grade level, repeating a grade in 1984, 1985, or 1986.

Table 5
Total Sample Repeaters by Year 1983 to 1986

	REPEATER		GRADE		PARENTS	
Year	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1984	63	19.3%	128	39.1%	144	44.0%
1985	46	14.1%	85	26.0%	82	25.1%
1986	44	13.5%	74	22.6%	79	24.2%

The REPEATER method consistently under-reports the number of repeaters in comparision to the PARENT criterion. In 1984 the REPEATER method reports 19.3%, in 1985 14.1%, and in 1986 13.5% of the students actually repeating a grade. In contrast, the GRADE method reports 39.1%, 26.0%, and 22.6% respectively, which is much closer to PARENTS reports of 44.0%, 25.1% and 25.2%. Since the REPEATER method is based on the number of repeaters reported in school enrollment records, it is clear that the school enrollment records consistently report only about half of the actual number of students repeating.

Dropouts: The discrepancies among the reconstruction methods in the number of dropouts reported is important as it reflects the

under-reporting of repeaters and also the over-estimation of new entrants to the education system. All students in Grade 1 in 1984, who are not recorded as repeaters, are assumed to be new entrants based on [New Entrants = Grade 1 Enrollment - Repeaters]. Following this process through, where dropouts are calculated on the basis of [Dropouts 1984 = Grade 1 enrollment 1983 - Grade 1 repeaters 1984 - New Entrants Grade 2], it is clear that under-reported repeaters in Grade 1 are counted as both dropouts and new entrants in Grade 1 in 1984. Table 6 summarizes the dropout data for the three reconstruction methodologies.

Table 6
Estimated and Reported Dropouts 1983 to 1986

	REPEATER		GRADE		PARENTS	
Year	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1983	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
1984	92	28.1%	21	6.4%	13	4.0%
1985	120	36.7%	34	10.4%	27	8.3%
1986	152	46.5%	49	15.0%	35	10.7%

While the REPEATER reconstruction estimates dropout for 1984, 1985, and 1986 at 28.1, 36.7, and 46.5 percent respectively, the GRADE reconstruction estimates 6.5, 10.4, and 15.0 percent, the PARENT reconstruction reports 4.0, 8.3, and 10.7 respectively. The REPEATER methodology significantly overestimates the number of dropouts in comparision to either the GRADE or PARENT approaches. As stated before, the REPEATER overestimation of dropouts is the direct result of under-reporting repeaters and will result in the overestimation of new entrants by this method.

Grade and Age: Two final tests of correspondence between school data and parent data were conducted. In 1983 parental and schools were in 100% agreement on the students' grade level, in 1984 86.2 percent, in 1985 90.5 percent, and in 1986 on 97.2 percent. This is an average correspondence between school grade enrollment records and parental reports of 93.5% per year. School records and parents were in agreement on the specific ages of the students 93.3% of the cases in 1983, 94.2% in 1984, 93.3% in 1985, and 94.5% in 1986. Although this is a high correspondence (93.9% per year) because parents are legally required to present the birth certificate of the child on first time enrollment a higher level of agreement might have been expected to be higher. Even with an average error rate of 6.5% for grade level per year (100 - 93.5) and 6.1% for reported age per year (100 - 93.9) both of these records are much more accurate than the reported number of repeaters. As a consequence a projection methodology based on school records of age and grade will be more accurate than a methodology based on reported repeaters.

D. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In order to assess the accuracy of the school based reports of repetitions, grade level, and age the academic histories of a cohort of 327 students, who entered Grade 1 for the first time in 1983, were reconstructed from school enrollment records and

parent interview information. The premise was that when parent and school information have high levels of congruency the school information is likely to be valid. Based on the comparison of the reconstructions based on school records of repeaters, school records of grade enrollment by name, and parent supplied information the following conclusions are drawn:

1. The school reports of grade level enrollment are valid based on a high level of congruency between parent and school information;

2. The school reports of student age at each grade level are valid based on congruency between parent and school information;

and,

3. The school reports of repeaters by grade is not a valid reflection of the actual situation based on a high level of disagreement between reported repetition status and school enrollment and parent information.

The implications of these conclusions are:

1. The information that schools send to the Ministry of Education regarding the grade attended by students and their ages is fairly accurate. Therefore, the Ministry data base includes valid information for the use of the age/grade approach to estimating national student flows in Honduras.

2. The reports of the number of repeating students, that schools send to the Ministry of Education, are not valid. Therefore, the current Ministry of Education projection method will underestimate repeaters and over estimate new students to grade level and dropouts.

This study provides only a preliminary assessment of the validity of the repetition, grade level enrollment, and age information in the Honduran educational data base but it strongly supports the use of an age/grade approach to calculating new entrants to grades, repeaters, and dropouts. The inherent inaccuracy of the

repetition reports and the apparent incentive to under-report the actual number of repetitions in each grade suggest that projection methodologies relying on this data will produce inaccurate pictures of student flows. Therefore, in the Honduran educational system, it is recommended that the BRIDGES projection methodology be used.

APPENDIX A

DATA COLLECTION FORMS

198- [illegible]

HOJA DE CARACTERISTICAS DE LA ESCUELA

-Nombre de la Escuela: [illegible]

Departamento: Olancho Municipio: Catacamas.

Aldea: [illegible]

-Cómo están los registros:

La cantidad de libros de registro de la Escuela están completos; pero los datos nominales no coinciden con los numéricos.

-Número de grados 6

-Número de maestros 5

-Número de alumnos 209

-Número de aulas 5

-Condición de la Escuela 5 Aulas en buen estado (2 adobe y 3 ladrillo) y 3 en construcción (De ladrillo)

-Características de la comunidad:

-Número de matriculados en primero en 1983 (incluir todos los niveles) 36 Niñas, 32 Varones → Fué el reporte oficial. | 37 M, 32 V → Es el listado real en el libro de matrícula.

-Número de repitentes entre los matriculados en primero en 1983 (todos los niveles) 1 alumno.

-Problemas para recolectar la información

En el libro de Notas Bimestrales llevado en el año 1982 únicamente [illegible] los notas de tres bimestres faltando los últimos dos restantes

ESCUELA _____ ENCUESTADOR _____

FECHA _____

N°	NOMBRE	DIRECCION	1983			1984			1985			1986	
			Fecha Nac	Grad	PRD	Fecha Nac	Grado Stat.	PRD	Fecha Nac	Grado Stat.	PRD	Fecha Nac	Grado Stat.
1													
2													
3													
4													
5													

Note: P=Promoted
R=Repeater
D=Dropout

034

CUESTIONARIO A MADRES DE NIÑOS MATRICULADOS POR PRIMERA VEZ EN PRIMERO EN 1983

INTRODUCCION:

- Preguntar por la madre del niño.
- Explicar lo que se está haciendo: Estudio sobre los niños que fueron matriculados en primero en 1983.
- Esta información le servirá al Ministerio de Educación Pública para mejorar la información sobre los niños de primaria.

PREGUNTAS:

Nombre del niño: _____

Nombre del encargado: _____

Escuela: _____

¿En qué fecha nació: 28 de Octubre de 1976 -

¿En qué año fue matriculado el niño por primera vez? 1983

¿Dónde lo matriculó?

Jardín de niños: _____

Escuela: _____ En qué grado? Primero

Si lo matriculó en pre-escolar preguntar: ¿En qué año fue matriculado en primer grado? _____

¿Ese fue el primer año que fue a primer grado? SI NO

Si el niño fue matriculado antes de 1983 preguntar: Ud. me dice que su hijo fue matriculado por primera vez en primero en _____, según los registros de la escuela su hijo fue de nuevo matriculado en primero en 1983: ¿Por qué lo matriculó de nuevo en primero? _____ _____ _____

En 1984, ¿matriculó a su hijo? **1 9 8 4**

No_____ ¿Por qué?_____

Si_____

¿En qué grado? Segundo Grado

¿En qué escuela?_____

- Si el niño fue matriculado en el mismo grado que el año anterior preguntar: ¿Por qué matriculó a su hijo de nuevo en primero?_____

En 1985, ¿matriculó a su hijo? **1 9 8 5**

No_____ ¿Por qué?_____

Si_____

¿En qué grado? Tercero

¿En qué escuela?_____

- Si el niño fue matriculado en el mismo grado que el año anterior preguntar: ¿Por qué matriculó a su hijo de nuevo en_____? _____

1 9 8 6

¿En 1986,¿matriculó a su hijo?

No_____ ¿Por qué?_____

_____

Si_____

¿En qué grado? Cuarto

¿En qué escuela?

- Si el niño fue matriculado en el mismo grado que el año anterior pregunter: ¿Por qué matricul a su hijo de nuevo en_____? _____

_____

NOMBRE ENCUESTADOR: José Roberto Martínez Vela

FECHA:_____

CUESTIONARIO A PROFESORES

Entrevista a docentes que matricularon a los niños en primero. Tratar de entrevistar al docente que efectuó esa labor en 1983 o año más reciente.

INTRODUCCION:

Estamos estudiando la cohorte de estudiantes que entró a primero en 1983 porque queremos saber cómo evolucionan los niños dentro del sistema escolar.

Esta información nos servirá para mejorar la calidad de las estadísticas manejadas por el Ministerio de Educación.

PREGUNTAS:

Nombre: _____

¿Cuándo ingresó al servicio docente? Desde 1983

¿Desde cuándo trabaja en esta escuela? Desde 1983

Durante el proceso de matrículas, ¿qué grados le ha tocado matricular?

1º, 5º, 6º grado

La matrícula, ¿se efectúa en la escuela? Si ✓

No _____

Si contesta no preguntar:

¿Donde realiza la matrícula? _____

¿Quién proporciona la información respecto a:

(a)-La identificación del niño Madre: Boleta de Nac...

(b)-La edad ___

Si no le esentan el documento, ¿ qué hace ?

No se les ha presentado este caso

La información de matrícula ¿ quién la traslada al libro de matrículas ?

Director [X] Sub-director [ ] Maestro [ ]

Los siguientes son una serie de casos imaginarios sobre los cua - les me gustaría saber su opinión:

(a)-¿Qué haría Ud. en el caso de un niño que fue promovido el año anterior si sus padres exigen que repita grado?

Averiguar las causas del porque quieren que repita grado. Si son justificadas aceptaría lo que dijo. Si no, le haría la forma para averiguar con padres lo que mejor sea.

Si es registrado en el mismo grado preguntar:

¿ Cómó lo registraría en el libro de matrículas ?

Repitente.

(b)-¿Que haría Ud. en el caso de un niño que fue promovido de primero a segundo grado si sus padres exigen que repita grado?

En primera, le diría que si es mejor que pase a segundo grado que para [illegible] lo aceptaría la matrícula en primero como repitente.

¿Cómo comprueba la edad? [illegible]

Si no le presenta el documento, ¿qué hace?

[illegible]

(c)-Último grado aprobado por el niño: _____

¿Cómo comprueba el último grado aprobado por el niño?

[illegible]

Si no le presentan el documento, ¿qué hace?

[illegible]

La información de matrículas, ¿quién la traslada al libro de matrículas?

Director [X] Sub-director [X] Maestro [X] _____

para poner su respectivo grado.

Zona: Cócamas #1 y 26

CUESTIONARIO A DIRECTORES

Entrevista a Directores donde la función no coincida con la de profesor de primer grado.

INTRODUCCION:

Estamos estudiando la cohorte de estudiantes que entró a primero en 1983 porque queremos saber cómo evolucionan los niños dentro del sistema escolar.

Esta información nos servirá para mejorar la calidad de las estadísticas manejadas por el Ministerio de Educación.

PREGUNTAS:

Nombre: _____

¿Quién matricula a los niños en su escuela?

Director [✓] Sub-director [✓] Maestro [✓] _____

Todo el Personal Docente y Administrativo de

Si responde que es el Director o el Sub-director preguntar:

¿ Lo hace Ud. (o el Sub-director) directamente ?

Si _____

No _____ ¿Quién? _____

Quién proporciona la información respecto a:

(a)- La identificación del niño [illegible]

(b)- La edad [illegible]

¿ Cómo comprueba la edad ? [illegible]

Si no le presenta el documento exigido, ¿qué hace [illegible]

(c)- El último grado aprobado por el niño [illegible] la boleta donde está registrado los mismos [illegible]

¿ Cómo comprueba el último grado aprobado por el niño ?

[illegible] identificaciones del niño en [illegible] inscripción final

Si no le presentan el documento, ¿ qué hace-?

Se busca en el libro de Promoción final

La información de matrícula ,¿ quién la traslada al libro de matrículas ?

Director [x] Sub-director [x] Maestro [x] ...

Cada uno pasa al libro la matrícula de su respectivo gr...

Los siguientes son una serie de casos imaginarios sobre los cua - les me gustaría saber su opinión.

(a)-¿Qué haría Ud.en el caso de un niño que fue promovido el año anterior si sus padres exigen que repita grado?

Buscar el libro en el ... que ... Buscar ... si éste ... en el grado y la matrícula en el ... en la Matrícula como recibido y la repetiría próximo parte mensual.

Si es registrado en el mismo grado preguntar:

¿ Cómó lo registraría en el libro de matrículas ?

Como un recibido.

(b)-¿Qué haría Ud.en el caso de un niño que fue promovido de primero a segundo grado si sus padres exigen que repita grado?

Buscar

Repetiría en el ... como ... y si la ... la ... la como recibido en el grado anterior y la repetiría en el siguiente para ... cua..

Si es registrado de nuevo en primero preguntar:

¿Cómo lo registraría en el libro de matrículas?

Como repitente.

Escuela: _____ **Municipio:** _____

Aldea: _____

Encuestador: [illegible]

Fecha: [illegible]

OBSERVACIONES: La Directora se encuentra con licencia por enfermedad, por lo que fué necesario ir a la casa de la Sub-Directora a fuerza para que nos prestara los libros de archivo y entrevistarla, pués ese día tenían libre porque andaban cobrando su cheque correspondiente al mes de Septiembre. Es de hacer notar que ella fué muy amenta a las solicitudes de trabajo que le hicimos.

APPENDIX B
MODEL AGE/GRADE METHODOLOGY

The age/grade methodology makes use of data on the age-distribution of the enrollment in each grade for two consecutive years. The basic idea behind this method is that there has to be a certain mathematical structure that determines the difference between two consecutive tables of enrollment by age and grade. This underlying structure must have age-specific repetition and dropout rates as its parameters.

To get estimates of the repetition and dropout rates the computation starts with the highest grade in the second of two consecutive years, where an assumption is made about the proportion of student who repeat the grade. Then, for each age and grade the enrollment of the grade is compared with the enrollment in the preceding age/grade in the first of these two years in order to compute the number of non-promoted students from the grade. Next, the number of non-promoted students are computed for each age/grade. The number of dropouts are estimated as a fixed proportion of the non-promoted. Finally the number of repeaters for each age/grade is computed as the difference between the estimated number of drop outs and the number of non-promoted.[3]

---

3. Schiefelbein, E. and Grossi, M.C. "Statistical report on repetition in Latin America". In UNESCO. Statistical Method for Improving the Estimation of Repetition and Dropout: Two Methodological Studies. Paris: UNESCO, 1981, pp. 1-94.

APPENDIX C
MINISTRY METHODOLOGY

According to the Standard Methodology that is used by the Ministry of Education, the enrollment in any given grade can be broken down into three main components: repeaters, promoters from the previous grade (or new-entrants), and dropouts. This relationship can be expressed by the following equation:

$$E_{t,g} = N_{t,g} + R_{t,g}$$

Where: $E_{t,g}$ is the number of students enrolled in grade "g" in year "t".

$N_{t,g}$ is the number "new" entrants to grade "g" in year "t", or the promoted from grade "g-1" in year "t-1".

$R_{t,g}$ is the number of repeaters in grade "g" in year "t".

The flow of students from one grade to the next can be expressed as a function of a set of grade specific transition rates (intake, promotion, repetition, and dropout rates. According to the method, dropouts and "new" entrants (or promoters) are computed from the following equations:

$$N_{t,g} = E_{t,g} - R_{t,g}$$

$$D_{t-1,g-1} = E_{t-1,g-1} - R_{t,g} - N_{t,g}$$

where: $D_{t-1,g-1}$, is the number of students dropping out from grade "g-1" in year "t-1".

These three equations show that the key figures, from which all the other estimates are derived. are the number of repeaters and the total enrollment by grade. New-entrants can be easily overestimated if repeaters are underreported, or if total enrollment is underreported, or by a combination of both factors.

1986. Repeaters were identified as those students who were enrolled in a grade level equal to or less than they had been enrolled in the previous year. New entrants to grade level were identified as those students who were enrolled in a grade level greater than they had been enrolled in the previous year. Dropouts were calculated on the same basis as for the REPEATER methodology. For example, the GRADE reconstruction for 1985 is based on the enrollment record of 1985 compared to the enrollment record for 1984 by individual student name and grade level.

Table D.2
Differences Between School Record Based Reconstructions and Parent Information

REPEATER Reconstruction

Year	Grade 1	Grade 2	Grade 3	Grade 4	Dropout
1984	-81	2	---	---	79
1985	-31	-49	-13	---	93
1986	-19	-29	-54	-15	117

GRADE Reconstruction

Year	Grade 1	Grade 2	Grade 3	Grade 4	Dropout
1984	-16	8	---	---	8
1985	-7	5	-5	---	7
1986	-7	6	-5	-8	14

Note: A (-) number is less than and a (+) number is greater than PARENT criterion.

For 1983 there is no disagreement among the three reconstructions since all students in the sample were verified as being new students in Grade 1. The reports of enrollment for Grade 2 in 1984, Grade 3 in 1985, and Grade 4 in 1986 are reasonably congruent across all reconstructions. However, beginning in 1984 there is increasing disagreement between the

REPEATER reconstruction and the PARENT criterion on repeaters and dropouts. The REPEATER method consistently under-reports the number of students repeating a grade level and, as a consequence, over-estimates the number of dropouts. For example, in 1984 the REPEATER method under-reports the number of students repeating Grade 1 by 81 and reports 2 more students in Grade 2 than did PARENTS. Since the formula for calculating dropouts is Dropouts = Cohort - Repeaters - New Entrants, the under-reported repeaters are generally reported as dropouts. A small number of the under-reported repeaters, in this instance 2 students, are reported as new entrants in Grade 2. Therefore the large disparities in the number of dropouts reported indicated a substantial under-reporting of repeaters from 1984 through 1986 in school enrollment records.

The GRADE method reflects a similar pattern to that of REPEATERS, with the exception of Grade 2, but the differences from PARENT criterion are small. The school enrollment records by grade and name are much more accurate that the records for repeaters. The magnitude of the differences is presented in Table D.3 in terms of the differences in Table D.2 as percentages of the total cohort.

Table D.3
Percent Differences Between School Record Based Reconstructions and Parent Information

REPEATER Reconstruction

Year	Grade 1	Grade 2	Grade 3	Grade 4	Dropout
1984	-24.8%	0.6%	---	---	24.2%
1985	-9.5%	-15.0%	-4.0%	---	28.4%
1986	-5.8%	-8.9%	-16.5%	-4.6%	35.8%

GRADE Reconstruction

Year	Grade 1	Grade 2	Grade 3	Grade 4	Dropout
1984	-4.9%	2.4%	---	---	2.4%
1985	-2.1%	1.5%	-1.5%	---	2.1%
1986	-2.1%	1.8%	-1.5%	-2.4%	4.3%

Note: A (-) percent is less than and a (+) percent is greater than PARENT criterion.

The proportion of the cohort reported by all three reconstruction methods progressing a grade level each year, specifically Grade 2 in 1984, Grade 3 in 1985, and Grade 4 in 1986, is fairly consistent. As noted with Table D.2, the consistent differences between the PARENT and REPEATER methods occurs for repetitions and dropouts in the cohort. By 1986, the REPEATER method estimates that 35.8% more of the cohort have dropped out of school than actually did as a direct result of under-reporting repeaters in school enrollment records. The differences between the GRADE and PARENT methods are small which supports the contention that school grade level enrollment records are more accurate than school records of repeaters.