

ED 021 901

UD 004 434

By- Short, Sue; And Others

EVALUATION REPORT ON TITLE I, ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965; FY '66.

Arkansas State Dept. of Education, Little Rock.

Pub Date 66

Note- 47p.

EDRS Price MF-\$0.25 HC-\$1.96

Descriptors- ATTENDANCE, *COMPENSATORY EDUCATION PROGRAMS, *DISADVANTAGED YOUTH, *FEDERAL PROGRAMS, HIGHER EDUCATION, INFORMATION DISSEMINATION, INTERAGENCY COOPERATION, MEASUREMENT INSTRUMENTS, PERSONNEL, PRIVATE SCHOOLS, *PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION, PROGRAM COSTS, *PROGRAM EVALUATION, READING ACHIEVEMENT, SPECIAL SERVICES, TABLES (DATA), TEST RESULTS

Identifiers- Arkansas

This report describes compensatory education activities for public and nonpublic school disadvantaged youth in Arkansas. Initial evaluation reveals that the Title I projects have been "extremely effective" and have increased the holding power of the schools. Attendance rates have improved considerably. Extensive tabular data is presented on school dropout rates, attendance, and higher education of program participants. Reading achievement and program costs are also tabulated. These and other program data are presented according to the format stipulated by the Office of Education. (LB)

04434

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE
PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION
POSITION OR POLICY.

A R K A N S A S

FY '66

Evaluation Report on Title I

Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965

UD 00A 434

ED021901

PART I

1. OPERATION AND SERVICES

In a few paragraphs, indicate the types of services that the State Educational Agency has provided to Local Educational Agencies.

- A. State-wide area conferences were conducted in eleven (11) areas of the State by the Commissioner of Education and the State Director of ESEA. These conferences were held during the month of July as pre-program informational conferences for the benefit of State Public School Administrators and other interested individuals.
- B. State-wide regional conferences were conducted in six (6) regions of the State by the State Director and a partial staff. These conferences were conducted during the month of October for the purpose of distributing pencil copies of application materials and tentative guidelines to Public School Administrators and other interested individuals.
- C. Individual conferences were conducted at the State Office with most of the School Administrators of the independent school districts of the state. The purpose of these conferences was to help the Administrator develop the application and to bring it into approvable form and to better help him understand the details and purposes of the Act, as it applies to his district.

- D. State-wide School Administrators Advisory Committee was established and members appointed by the State Commissioner of Education. This group conducted monthly meetings and has as its purposes: keeping the State Education Agency informed on problems encountered by the LEA and the recommendation of policy on various aspects of the Act.
- E. State-wide Lay-group Advisory Committee was established and appointed by the State Commissioner of Education. This group conducted monthly meetings and has as its purposes: keeping the State Educational Agency informed on questions and suggestions which patrons of the various districts of the State might have and the recommendation of policy on various aspects of the Act.
- F. On-site visits were made to several of the school districts by the State supervisors to get first hand information on and to see project activities in action. Also, these visits provide an ideal opportunity for supervisors to counsel with superintendents and coordinators on project administration and planning for future projects.
- G. Various workshops were conducted at colleges and in centrally located areas to permit administrators to discuss and study Title I activities, requirements, and problems. Probably the most successful of these was held at the University of Arkansas.

H. Small group meetings were arranged by LEAs to keep the lay public and professional staffs informed. These meetings of PTA groups, local and area teachers' meetings, advisory group meetings, and others included talks and discussions by State staff members concerning Title I.

*State Agencies were invited to and did attend the above. No differentiation was made toward these agencies regarding informational programs and visits.

2. DISSEMINATION

(a) Describe how local projects are disseminating data--

(1) to other local agencies

- a. Reports and discussions at faculty, PTA, advisory committee, civic, and other small group meetings.
- b. Newspaper articles
- c. Radio and television broadcasts and news briefs
- d. School newsletter articles

(2) to the State agency

- a. Progress questionnaire
- b. Annual evaluation report
- c. Printed pamphlets
- d. Short narratives of most effective activity.

(b) Describe State plans and arrangements for disseminating information on promising educational practices.

- (1) Distribution of relevant pamphlets.
- (2) Distribution of two (2) pertinent films.
- (3) Making available at State Office ERIC materials.
- (4) Distribution of certain information taken from ERIC documents.
- (5) Review and distribution of information on local projects.
- (6) Department of Education Newsmagazine.

* Dissemination by state agencies closely resembles methods used by LEAs.

3. EVALUATION

- (a) Describe guidelines, modifications of previous guidelines, and other types of assistance your State has provided the local agencies for evaluating Title I projects.

The primary evaluative assistance provided LEAs has been by way of consultative and counseling services. The evaluation of Title I projects and methods for achieving this have been strongly emphasized in all regional and area conferences.

Leon Wilson, our office staff member in charge of evaluating the State program, has conducted individual conferences and answered individual questions by phone.

- (b) List the names and titles of all State personnel involved in providing evaluation assistance.

Leon Wilson, Supervisor of Evaluation

Sue Short, Assistant Supervisor of Evaluation

Gloria King, Secretary to the Supervisor of Evaluation

- (c) List the names, titles, and institutions or agencies of all consultants involved in providing evaluation assistance to the State.

Hugh Lovett, Director of Guidance, State Department of Education

Leroy Pennington, Supervisor of Guidance, State Department of Education

Mrs. Delma Turner, Supervisor of Elementary Guidance, State Department of Education

Frank Cannaday, Supervisor of Research and Statistics, State Department of Education

* The State Agencies had the benefit of all services listed above.

- (d) How many projects employed each of the following evaluation designs?

Number of Projects	Evaluation Design
39	Two group experimental design using the project group and a conveniently available non-project group as the control.
76	One group design using a pretest and posttest on the project group to compare observed gains or losses with expected gains.
320	One group design using pretest and/or posttest scores on the project group to compare observed performance with local, State or national groups.
135	One group design using test data on the project group to compare observed performance with expected performance based upon data for past years in the project school.
157	One group design using test data on the project group, but no comparison data.
226	One measurement only with assumptions about the degree of achievement.

4. MAJOR PROBLEM AREAS

(a) Under each of the following categories, describe the major problems encountered by your State in administering the Title I program:

1. Reviewing Proposals

- a. The large number (410) of independent districts in the State. (Some with unqualified personnel, understaffed, and limited enrollments.
- b. The wide variation of needs in the two distinct sections of the state. (The mountainous section of our state has practically no Negro population. Whereas, the Delta section has very high percentages of same, along with high percentages of dependent children. This results in a very wide variation of needs).
- c. The submission of a Project Description which follows the suggested outline.

2. Operation and Service

- a. The thirty percent (30%) regulation has penalized some of our most needy LEAs.
- b. The making of minor corrections on the legal application.
- c. The provision for budget changes.
- d. The provision for supplements and amendments.
- e. The establishment of policy concerning the degree of detail. (Such as equipment lists, etc.)
- f. Determination of family finances in order to establish low income attendance areas.

3. Evaluation

- a. The establishment of measurable objectives and corresponding evaluative measures for various types of project activities.
- b. The influencing of LEAs on importance of establishing baseline data.
- c. The influencing LEAs to expand the idea of evaluation beyond a mere standardized achievement instrument.
- d. The submission of poorly prepared reports by LEAs.

(b) List and briefly describe any suggestions or recommendations for revising the legislation in order to alleviate these problems.

1. The designation of strict attendance areas only if the concentration of children from low income families for the district as a whole is less than 30% and/or the total number of children residing in the district exceeds 3,000.
2. The timing of appropriated funds should be improved in order to implement successful programs.
3. A larger percentage of funds for state administration. Required areas such as evaluation have great need for workshops and consultative services.

5. IMPLEMENTATION OF SECTION 205 (a) (1)

(a) In order of prevalence, describe the types of projects that were not approvable when first submitted on the basis of size, scope, and quality.

- (1) Construction projects
- (2) Equipment with no related staff
- (3) Bus projects with no related activity
- (4) Food personnel included in projects
- (5) Service projects with no instructional activity

(b) In order of prevalence, describe the common misconceptions of local educational agencies concerning the purposes of Title I and the requirements for size, scope, and quality.

- (1) Projects designed to benefit the entire school enrollment.
- (2) Projects designed to satisfy requirements for accreditation.
- (3) Projects completely aimed at providing welfare benefits.
- (4) Projects directed toward facilities with no related staff.

* The State Agencies were dealt with very mildly as to this phase of project approval. The thinking of our office was since their allotment was based on the entire enrollment practically any type project proposed would be approvable.

6. COORDINATION OF TITLE I AND COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS

(a) Number of projects in the local educational agencies that serve an area where there is an approved Community Action Program.

There were 216 projects in areas where there are approved Community Action Programs.

- (b) Total amount of Title I money approved for LEAs where there is an approved Community Action Program.

These 216 projects budgeted a total of \$11,898,410.

- (c) What action has been taken at the State level to insure coordination and cooperation between Title I applicants and Community Action Agencies at the local level.

As soon as the Title I program became operative in October 1965, Clarence Morris, Title I Supervisor, was assigned to liaison between State Office of Economic Opportunity and Title I of ESEA. During the past year many joint conferences were held to develop plans for local cooperative effort. As a result of these meetings a Joint Policy Statement was issued by the Director of State OEO and the State Commissioner of Education which serves as a guide for LEAs and CAAs to build cooperative and complementary programs. In October 1966 the State OEO Director appointed Mrs. Phillis Blevins, Coordinator of Education Programs to work with Mr. Morris of our office to effect coordinations of the two programs at the state level. Mr. Morris has taken part as a consultant in three training workshops for local CAA directors. State-wide regional meetings were held for school administrators last summer and a portion of these programs was devoted to the required coordination of ESEA and OEO programs.

- (d) List and briefly describe the successes in securing Community Action Agency--Local Education Agency cooperation.

Our greatest area of cooperative effort has been that of pre-school programs held during the summer. Many LEAs teamed with local CAAs to develop combined pre-school and remedial programs in which the major education costs, i.e. teachers'

salaries, were paid from ESEA funds while services such as food and transportation were provided by the local CAA. In a few counties such as Benton County in northwest Arkansas total educational programs involving vista workers, counselors, remedial teachers, food, clothing, and medical services are being jointly provided by the LEAs and the local CAA.

- (e) List and briefly describe the problems in securing Community Action Agency--Local Education Agency cooperation.

One of the greatest problems in developing local cooperative effort stems from the fact that OEO plans and projects must be approved on a national rather than local level. There is often a long wait to learn whether the CAAs share of the program will be funded.

A second set of problems develop because OEO tends to assume universal educational needs (for example pre-school) over large areas, whereas individual schools may find that the most pressing needs vary from one community to another.

- (f) List and briefly describe the inter-relationships of the two programs at the local level particularly the extent to which the two acts are used in a reinforcing manner.

There is a wide variation in the extent to which the two programs are used to reinforce each other from one area of the State to another. Many areas still are not covered by CAAs. As mentioned earlier, there are a few areas in which total programs are built so that each supplements the other. In others nothing more than token coordination is effected. The greatest causes for this are related to the problems mentioned in (e) above.

*(f) Each of our state agencies has worked very closely with both their local CAAs and the State OEO organization and have coordinated the available CAA programs with their Title I programs to great advantages. Examples would be NYC, College Work Study, and others.

(g) List and briefly describe any suggestions or recommendations for revising the legislation concerning Community Action Programs as they relate to Title I.

Many school administrators complain that too much of the "coordination and cooperation" is all one-sided. OEO is accused often of "cooperating" only to extend programs of its own such as "Headstart". We think that the law should be changed to require the LEA to "coordinate" with all other local agencies which may be concerned with similar problems, but any inference of actual "control" by OEO or others over local school programs should not be a part of the law.

*(g) No additional recommendations.

7. INTER-RELATIONSHIP OF TITLE I WITH OTHER TITLES OF ESEA

How are funds for Title I being used in connection with:

(a) Title II

1. Our Title II State Plan relates very closely to the philosophy of Title I in that it makes special provisions by way of extra funds for the more financially needy and educationally lacking LEAs.
2. Many librarians have been employed through Title I funds with emphasis in most cases on elementary.

3. Many projects proposed library improvements including badly needed materials and equipment and in a few projects provisions for remodeling or construction of library facilities.

(b) Title III

1. In the state office, Title I Supervisor Bill Pate has the special assignment of assisting LEAs in planning and coordinating Title III applications.
2. LEAs in proposing their Title III projects are in many instances maintaining the philosophy of Title I and relating the activities to the educationally deprived child.
3. Personnel employed with Title I funds are being utilized in planning Title III applications. This is especially true for those LEAs that had sufficient funds to hire a Title I director.

(c) Title IV

Arkansas has joined with the states of Mississippi, Northern Louisiana, Eastern Oklahoma, Southeastern Kansas, and Southwest Missouri in the submission of a proposed Title IV project establishing a Regional Educational Laboratory to be located in Little Rock, Arkansas. When and if this laboratory is established and functioning the primary objective will be to assist the public schools in research and dissemination. This type assistance could very well be related to Title I needs and requirements.

(d) Title V

Arkansas' Title V funds are providing for the following positions: 3 elementary supervisors, 1 art supervisor, 1 music supervisor, 1 physical education supervisor, 1 school plant supervisor, 2 data processing employees, 1 administrative assistant, and 4 secretarial employees. The relationship of these positions with the primary programs of Title I is very helpful and essential. The elementary supervisors relate very closely with the demands for upgraded reading programs. Organized programs in art, music, and elementary physical education are new ventures for many of our school districts. The school plant service has certainly been challenged with the expanded need for facilities necessary to house Title I programs. The data processing department is a necessity in order to appropriately evaluate Title I programs. This phase was not functional in time for successful utilization in this evaluation, however, we are looking forward to having their assistance for the FY '67 evaluation.

(e) List and briefly describe the successes in developing and implementing projects relating Title I with other Titles of ESEA.

Books and materials were purchased and placed in a central location for teacher checkout, thereby eliminating individual teacher orders and permitting much wider use of individual items. The library has become the focal point for the entire school program especially for courses which require reading and research. Facilities provided with Title I funds are used to house materials purchased with Title II funds. Employees

of Title I have greatly accelerated planning, organizing, and implementing various phases of Title II and Title III.

(f) List and briefly describe the problem areas involved in developing and implementing projects relating Title I with other Titles of ESEA.

1. Delayed delivery of seriously needed equipment and materials in order to implement library services.
2. Difficulty in making application, ordering, and receiving materials purchased with Title II funds.
3. Locating qualified librarians.
4. Title I being limited to certain attendance areas and Title II with no limiting factors creates problems. The same holds for Title III programs.

(g) Describe any suggestions or recommendations for revising the legislation that would facilitate a more effective use of Title II, III, IV, and V in reinforcing Title I.

1. The administration of the Arkansas Title II State Plan is too cumbersome and time consuming and should be revised.
2. Some funds under Title II should be available for salaries at the LEA level.
3. Some funds under Title III should be available for consultation personnel on the SEA level.

8. COOPERATIVE PROJECTS BETWEEN DISTRICTS

(a) List and briefly describe the successes in developing and implementing cooperative projects between two or more districts.

We approved only two projects of this nature as follows with a listing of cooperating districts for each:

<u>JEFFERSON COUNTY COOP.</u>	<u>PROJECT NO. 66-207</u>
Plum Bayou	LEA Code No. 013-035-06R-04
Sherrill	LEA Code No. 013-035-07R-04
Jefferson County	LEA Code No. 013-035-11R-04
Wabaseka	LEA Code No. 013-035-08R-04
Linwood	LEA Code No. 013-035-04R-04
Altheimer	LEA Code No. 013-035-01R-04
Humphrey	LEA Code No. 013-035-03R-04
White Hall	LEA Code No. 013-035-10U-04

<u>MALVERN COOPERATIVE</u>	<u>PROJECT NO. 66-331</u>
Rural Dale	LEA Code No. 013-063-05R-04
Malvern	LEA Code No. 013-030-04U-04
Saline County	LEA Code No. 013-063-06R-04
Bauxite	LEA Code No. 013-063-01R-04
Glen Rose	LEA Code No. 013-030-02R-04
Ouachita	LEA Code No. 013-030-05R-04
Benton	LEA Code No. 013-063-02U-04
Bryant	LEA Code No. 013-063-03R-04
Magnet Cove	LEA Code No. 013-030-03R-04
Bismarck	LEA Code No. 013-030-01R-04

The success of both of these projects was in the area of instruction. These cooperating districts probably could not have found qualified personnel nor would they have had sufficient funds to implement such activities individually.

- (b) List and briefly describe the problem areas involved in developing and implementing cooperative projects between two or more districts.

The problems experienced would fall in the area of administration. The difficulty arises when one administrator attempts to administer one activity from outside a school setting when all other activities are administered by the appointed official from within that setting by an official board. Also the services may have been too thinly spread in some cases resulting in a lacking activity in one or more of the participating schools.

- (c) List and briefly describe any suggestions or recommendations for revising the legislation concerning cooperative projects between districts.

Legislation might be revised to encourage districts to arrange for cooperative personnel to be administered by each LEA.

Possibly cooperative services could be provided and administered at the state level.

9. NON-PUBLIC SCHOOL PARTICIPATION

- (a) What steps have been or are being taken to encourage initiative of the local administrators in contacting non-public school officials?

The SEA has specifically contacted each LEA which has students attending non-public schools and made them aware of the regulations pertaining to this phase of the Act. The LEAs and the SEA have followed through in one or more of the following ways:

1. Arranged for personal administrative conferences with non-public school officials.
2. Invited non-public school officials to attend state and local meetings pertaining to P. L. 89-10.
3. Arranged joint planning conferences.
4. Arranged for periodic conferences to keep the non-public school officials informed as to new developments.
5. Persons directly involved in non-public schools were appointed as members of advisory groups.

- (b) What successes have been experienced in developing and implementing public and non-public school cooperative projects?

The LEA reports indicate successful relationships in developing and implementing cooperative activities in one or more of the following ways:

1. Instructional materials and equipment were purchased and used on a cooperative basis.
2. Officials worked together in identifying and planning programs for educationally deprived students.
3. Personal services such as health examinations, vision and hearing examinations and appliances, clothing, books and supplies were provided on need basis without regard to school in which enrolled.
4. Special services such as guidance, social work, speech ~~cor~~ correction, nursing activities, and summer programs have been made available to children enrolled in non-public schools.

- (c) What problems have been experienced in developing and implementing public and non-public school cooperative projects?

Practically every report from our LEAs indicates a very high degree of cooperation with few or no problems. Following are problems or potential problems as indicated by reports:

1. Lack of concern on the part of non-public school officials.
2. Lack of understanding as to the intent of the Act.
3. Difficulty in providing for the needs on the amount of available funds and arriving at a formula for equitable participation.

4. Scheduling materials and equipment for maximum benefit.

(d) List and briefly describe any suggestions or recommendations for revising the legislation concerning public and non-public school participation.

Our LEAs indicate on their reports the following suggestions:

1. Provide more specific information concerning non-public school student participation.
2. Provide information on successful methods and approaches for participation of non-public school students.
3. Determine definitely to what extent federal funds may be expended for non-public school students on their own campus.

(e) Number of projects and non-public school children participating by type of arrangement.

SCHEDULE	ON PUBLIC SCHOOL GROUNDS ONLY		ON NON-PUBLIC SCHOOL GROUNDS ONLY		ON BOTH PUBLIC & NON-PUBLIC SCHOOL GROUNDS	
	Proj	Children	Proj	Children	Proj	Children
Regular School Day	58	3838	9	702	4	610
Summer	9	550			6	1354
TOTAL	67	4388	9	702	10	1964

10. SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS

(a) If your State has printed State guidelines or disseminated other publications for implementing Title I programs, please enclose five copies of each. (Enclosed find copies in addition to those contained in Interim Report.)

1. Regional Conference Handout Packet

Guidelines
Parts I, II, III
Instructions

2. Service Letters

3. Operations Memorandums

4. Pamphlets and Booklets

"Selected Lists of Children's Books & Recordings"

"Education, An Answer to Poverty"

"Functions & Qualifications for School Nurses"

"A Chance for A Change"

"A Chance for the Disadvantaged"

"Southern Education Report--Vol. 1:4"

"The First Big Step"

"A Chance for the Disadvantaged as well as the Ambitious"
Newport School District

"A Time for Self-Renewal"

5. Evaluation Suggestion Sheet

6. Advisory Committee Reports

(b) If your State has contracted for evaluations of Title I programs or if LEAs have contracted with outside agencies for such evaluations, please enclose five copies of each evaluation.

No evaluation contracts were made.

(c) Submit a compilation of objective measurements of educational attainment for programs funded under Title I.

This information is provided in Table 7.

- (d) Continue to supply complete data on the previously submitted 10% sample of approved fiscal 1966 grants.

To be mailed to U. S. Office under separate cover.

All materials and information supplied to LEAs was also supplied to the State Agencies.

PART II

1. STATISTICAL INFORMATION

Class- ification (1)	Number of LEA's for which Title I programs have been approved (2)	Funds Actually Committed (3)	Unduplicated Count of Children				Average cost per pupil Col. 3 by Col. 4 (8)
			Total Col. 5, 6 & 7 (4)	Public (5)	Non Public (6)	Not Enrolled (7)	
A	4	\$ 1,416,950	15,451	14,818	463	170	\$ 91.83
B	2	901,426	5,268	5,253	15		177.10 175.28
C	5	491,397 11,099,690	4,568	4,553		15	107.50 108.91
D	103	11,223,947	102,022	100,690	897	435	110.01 108.80
E	290	6,478,260 6,742,165	44,099	43,521	124	454	146.90 152.89
TOTAL	404	20,387,723 20,805,927	171,408	168,835	1,499	1,074	118.90 \$ 121.30
State Agencies	3	142,782 149,000	875	875	0	0	163.10 \$ 170.28
GRAND TOTAL	407	20,530,505 20,954,927	172,283	169,710	1,499	1,074	119.10 \$ 121.63

2. ESTABLISHING PROJECT AREAS

List in rank order the most widely used methods for establishing project areas.

A. a,b,c,e,f,g,i

B. a,b,c,e,f,g,i

C. a,b,c,g,i

D. a,h,b,c,d,i

E. a,h,b,c,d,i

Key - a. Census information

b. AFDC payments

c. Free school lunches

d. School survey

e. Health statistics

f. Housing statistics

g. Employment statistics

h. Teacher opinions

i. Advisory committee opinions

3. NEEDS

List in rank order and describe the most pressing pupil needs in your State that Title I identified to meet.

A. a,b,c,d,e,f,g

B. a,b,c,d,e,f,g

C. a,b,c,d,e,f,g

D. a,b,c,d,e,f,g

E. a,b,c,d,e,f,g

State Agencies. a,d,e,f,g

- Key - a. Low level verbal functioning
b. Inadequate nutrition
c. Poor health
d. Inadequate image of self
e. Inadequate cultural appreciation
f. Speech defects
g. Visual and hearing defects

4. LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY PROBLEMS

List and briefly describe the principal problems local officials encountered in implementing projects.

- A. a,b,e,g,h
B. a,b,e,g,h
C. a,b,c,e,g,h
D. a,b,c,d,e,f,g,h
E. a,b,c,d,e,f,g,h

State Agencies. a,e,g,h

- Key - a. Lack of qualified professional personnel (Reading, librarians, counselors, teachers of the handicapped, art and music teachers)
b. Determination of eligibility for personal services.
c. Lack of pre-program evaluative data.
d. Lack of available health personnel. (Nurses, dentists, doctors)
e. Lack of necessary facilities.
f. Lack of administrative assistance.
g. Poor timing for initiating school programs.
h. Securing necessary materials, supplies, and equipment.

5. PREVALENT ACTIVITIES

List the most prevalent types of Title I activities in your State.

- A. a,b,c,d,e
- B. a,d,e
- C. a,d,e
- D. a,b,d,c,e
- E. a,b,c,d,e,f

State Agencies. a,c,e

- Key - a. Language arts
- b. Summer school
 - c. Library Improvement
 - d. Nutrition
 - e. Health
 - f. Guidance
 - e. Cultural enrichment

6. INNOVATIVE PROJECTS

List and briefly describe innovative and/or exemplary projects or activities that include new approaches for each classification of LEA.

Classification A:

Little Rock School District

State Project Number 66-045

Little Rock operated and purchased a mobile dental unit. The unit consisted of two completely equipped chairs staffed with two dentists and a dental technician for each. This unit is used in the different project areas, moving from school to school.

Classification B:

There were no real innovative projects in this classification.

Classification C:

There were no real innovative projects in this classification.

Classification D:

Paragould School District

State Project Number 66-210

Paragould proposed to enrich their curriculum by offering to elementary students public school music and art along with modern foreign languages. They installed closed circuit television to teach these subjects and enrich culturally other subject areas in all schools. There is a shortage of good teachers and this would allow them to use their best teachers in the various subject areas. They employed a director of instructional television, a public school music teacher, an elementary art teacher, and a part time consulting engineer. They produced their own tapes and films to be telecast from their own studio and supplemented these with other films and tapes. Educational T. V. from Channel 10 in Memphis was used as much as possible to supplement their own program. Teachers' guides were provided in advance so that proper preparation could be made. In-service training for their teachers on the use of instructional television was also provided.

Classification E:

Greenway School District

State Project Number 66-396

The Greenway School established cooking classes to teach and inform the mothers of the children from low income families the art of preparing more nutritious and well balanced meals, in wider variety, from the basic foods received as surplus commodities. They felt that if the mothers learned how to add

to the basic commodities that they received that the whole family would have fewer health problems. This school was held for ten weeks with one meeting per week, two hours per meeting. Three cooking instructors were hired to present these classes.

State Agencies

Arkansas Childrens' Colony, Conway, Arkansas

State Project Number 66-408

The aim of the Arkansas Childrens' Colony was to establish an instrumental music program with the following objectives:

1. Develop a marching band.
2. Develop muscular coordination through marching and the manipulation of the keys and valves on the instruments.
3. Develop reading awareness through the alphabet work involved in the names of the notes.
4. Develop group activity and social awareness necessary to play the music together.
5. Develop math awareness through the number and counting work involved in the rhythmic aspects of music.

At the present time there are 71 students in the band.

In addition to band programs, the music program had been started at Level I with the non-ambulatory with the aim of developing awareness, muscular response, development and coordination and group consciousness using instrumental music as an intense motivation. Also, they had a half hour a week visit to each cottage (above Level I) for group singing, guitar instruction, dancing, etc., emphasizing active participation by the children. This was carried on by two volunteers assisting in the music department.

7. METHODS OF INCREASING STAFF FOR TITLE I PROJECTS

Summarize the methods LEAs are using to develop or increase staff for Title I projects.

A. a,b,c,d,e,f,g

B. b,c,e,g

C. a,b,c,e,g

D. a,b,c,d,e,f,g

E. a,b,c,d,e,g,h

State Agencies. a,b,c,f,g

Key - a. Workshops

b. In-service Evening or Saturday College Courses

c. Summer College Courses

d. Additional hours for regular staff

e. Summer programs involving regular staff

f. Supervision by master teachers

g. College graduates attracted from other professions

h. Retired teachers

8. MEASURING INSTRUMENTS

For each school level, list the most prevalently used instruments including standardized achievement tests.

A. 1-3: a
4-6: b
7-9: b
10-12: e

B. 1-3: b
4-6: b
7-9: a
10-12: b

C. 1-3: a
4-6: a
7-9: d
10-12: d

D. 1-3: e
4-6: b
7-9: b
10-12: f

E. 1-3: b
4-6: c
7-9: f
10-12: b

Key - a. Metropolitan Achievement Test
b. Iowa Test of Basic Skills
c. California Reading Test
d. California Mental Maturity
e. California Achievement Test
f. SRA Achievement Test

9. ANALYSIS OF EFFECTIVE ACTIVITIES AND METHODS

(a) For each school level listed below, cite the five project activities which you judge to have been most effective.

A. Early years: a,b,c,h,j
Middle years: a,b,c,h,j
Teen years: b,c,d,h,j

B. Early years: a,b,c,e,h
Middle years: a,b,c,e,h
Teen years: a,d,h,i,l

C. Early years: a,b,d,h,j
Middle years: a,b,d,h,j
Teen years: a,b,d,h,j

D. Early years: b,c,e,h,k
Middle years: a,b,c,e,h
Teen years: b,c,d,h,l

E. Early years: b,c,h,j,k
Middle years: a,b,c,e,h
Teen years: b,c,d,h,l

State Agencies

Early years: a,c,e,f,g
Middle years: a,c,e,f,g
Teen years: a,c,e,f,g

- Key - a. Reading
- b. Summer School
 - c. Library Improvement
 - d. Guidance
 - e. Special Education
 - f. Cultural Enrichment
 - g. Speech Therapy
 - h. Nutrition
 - i. Clothing
 - j. Health
 - k. Vision
 - l. Books and Supplies

(b) For each of the project activities you listed above, discuss the strengths and weaknesses of critical procedural aspects.

Reading

- a. strengths: b,c,h
- b. weaknesses: a,d,g

Summer School

- a. strengths: a,h
- b. weaknesses: f,g,i

Library Improvement

- a. strengths: b,e,h
- b. weaknesses: a,d,g

Guidance

- a. strengths: b,e,i
- b. weaknesses: a,d,g

Special Education

- a. strengths: b,e,i
- b. weaknesses: a,d,g

Cultural Enrichment

- a. strengths: b,c,i
- b. weaknesses: a,d,e,g

Speech Therapy

- a. strengths: b,c,i
- b. weaknesses: a,d,e,g

Nutrition

- a. strengths: d,e,i
- b. weaknesses: a,f,g

Clothing

- a. strengths: i
- b. weaknesses: f,g

Health

- a. strengths: a,i
- b. weaknesses: d,f,g

Vision

- a. strengths: i
- b. weaknesses: f,g

Books and Supplies

- a. strengths: b,i
- b. weaknesses: f,g

Key - a. Facilities

b. Materials

c. Equipment

d. Qualified personnel

e. Schedule

f. Organization

g. Evaluation

h. Additional personnel (provides individual attention)

i. Attitude of students

10. GENERAL ANALYSIS OF TITLE I

Generalize about the effectiveness of Title I in enhancing educational opportunities, experiences, achievement, and general attitudes toward education.

Initial evaluation indicates that Title I has been extremely effective in improving educational opportunities of disadvantaged youths. It is believed that many of our potential drop-outs have remained in school this year because the availability of funds makes it possible for some of the basic necessities to be provided.

Many underachieving students are now receiving instruction at a level at which they can achieve some measure of success. Several new instructional approaches are being experimented with. Certain courses aimed at the deprived child have been introduced.

All of these additional special benefits for and interest shown in the educationally and economically deprived child has caused a tremendous positive change in his attitude toward teachers, classmates, studying and school in general. His attendance has improved considerably probably because of the interest being shown in him and the change in his interest toward education.

Probably the most outstanding effect of Title I in general has been on educators themselves. Most have gained insight into the problems and needs of deprived children who in most instances make up at least one-third of the school population. The program has caused educators to assess their school programs from the standpoint of individual needs rather than the needs of the schools.

TABLE 1

Projects in: Skill Development Subjects	Projects in: Attitudinal & Behavioral Development							
	Grades 1 - 3	Grades 4 - 6	Grades 7 - 9	Grades 10 - 12	Grades 1 - 3	Grades 4 - 6	Grades 7 - 9	Grades 10 - 12
<u>Measures</u>								
1. <u>Standardized Tests & Inventories</u>								
a. Achievement	77	88	68	29				
b. Intelligence	17	17	16	11				
c. Aptitude				9				
d. Interest				6			2	8
e. Attitude			1	2			5	16
2. <u>Other Tests</u>								
a. <u>Locally Devised Tests</u>								
b. <u>Teacher Made Tests</u>	81	85	72	35				
3. <u>Other Measures</u>								
a. <u>Teacher Ratings</u>								
b. <u>Anecdotal Records</u>								
c. <u>Observer Reports</u>	15	21	16	5	33	28	15	10

Based on representative sample of 100 projects

TABLE 2

SUMMARY OF EFFECTIVENESS FOR TYPES OF PROJECTS

Reading Programs			
	To improve classroom performance in reading beyond usual expectations.		
School Level	Substantial Progress Achieved	Some Progress	Little or No Progress Achieved
Grades 1-3	75	116	9
Grades 4-6	80	125	10
Grades 7-9	55	90	5
Grades 10-12	33	46	5

Guidance Programs			
	To change (in a positive direction) their attitudes toward school and education.		
School Level	Substantial Progress Achieved	Some Progress	Little or No Progress Achieved
Grades 1-3	8	14	
Grades 4-6	12	15	
Grades 7-9	9	19	
Grades 10-12	4	15	

Cultural Enrichment Programs			
	To raise the children's cultural appreciation level.		
School Level	Substantial Progress Achieved	Some Progress	Little or No Progress Achieved
Grades 1-3	18	17	
Grades 4-6	18	19	1
Grades 7-9	14	12	
Grades 10-12	11	10	

Mathematics Programs

	To improve classroom performance in mathematics beyond usual expectations.		
School Level	Substantial Progress Achieved	Some Progress	Little or No Progress Achieved
Grades 1-3	9	9	1
Grades 4-6	11	10	2
Grades 7-9	8	18	2
Grades 10-12	2	11	

Special Education Programs

	To improve the handicapped child's emotional and social stability and/or that of their families.		
School Level	Substantial Progress Achieved	Some Progress	Little or No Progress Achieved
Grades 1-3	5	8	
Grades 4-6	8	7	
Grades 7-9	4	2	
Grades 10-12	1	2	

Library-Curriculum Materials Center Programs

	To improve children's verbal functioning and creativeness.		
School Level	Substantial Progress Achieved	Some Progress	Little or No Progress Achieved
Grades 1-3	15	13	
Grades 4-6	18	15	
Grades 7-9	13	12	
Grades 10-12	12	9	

Physical Education Programs

School Level	To improve the physical development of the children.		
	Substantial Progress Achieved	Some Progress	Little or No Progress Achieved
Grades 1-3	13	5	
Grades 4-6	13	9	
Grades 7-9	12	7	
Grades 10-12	9	6	

Food Services

School Level	To improve the nutritional health of the children.		
	Substantial Progress Achieved	Some Progress	Little or No Progress Achieved
Grades 1-3	66	30	
Grades 4-6	66	30	
Grades 7-9	60	42	
Grades 10-12	42	35	

Clothing Services

School Level	To provide adequate clothing for the children.		
	Substantial Progress Achieved	Some Progress	Little or No Progress Achieved
Grades 1-3	63	18	
Grades 4-6	62	18	
Grades 7-9	54	27	
Grades 10-12	36	27	

Health Services

School Level	To improve the physical health of the children.		
	Substantial Progress Achieved	Some Progress	Little or No Progress Achieved
Grades 1-3	58	34	2
Grades 4-6	61	36	3
Grades 7-9	63	34	2
Grades 10-12	46	32	3

TABLE 3

AVERAGE DAILY ATTENDANCE AND AVERAGE DAILY MEMBERSHIP RATES
FOR TITLE I PROJECT SCHOOLS COMPARED WITH STATE NORM $\frac{1}{1}$

Grade	If Possible 1963 - 1964			If Possible 1964 - 1965			If Possible 1965 - 1966					
	Title I Schools		$\frac{1}{1}$	Title I Schools		$\frac{1}{1}$	Title I Schools		$\frac{1}{1}$			
	ADA	ADA	ADA	ADA	ADA	ADA	ADA	ADA	ADA			
12th Grade	19,200	20,300	21,984	23,056	21,200	22,200	25,117	26,400	22,400	23,400	24,888	26,132
11th Grade	22,400	23,600	27,557	28,989	22,600	23,800	27,089	28,573	20,300	21,400	27,064	28,501
10th Grade	24,400	25,600	29,806	31,389	21,600	22,600	29,389	30,989	24,600	25,600	29,460	31,137
9th Grade	23,200	24,100	31,968	33,687	24,900	25,800	31,699	33,434	25,700	26,600	32,003	33,617
8th Grade	24,700	26,300	33,349	35,111	25,100	26,100	33,390	35,275	25,300	26,600	34,129	35,870
7th Grade	27,200	28,400	35,162	37,116	26,200	27,400	35,475	37,485	25,400	26,300	36,778	38,774
6th Grade	23,600	24,600	35,204	37,009	23,300	24,200	35,941	37,742	26,500	27,600	36,213	37,901
5th Grade	23,200	24,400	36,527	38,391	27,400	28,500	36,402	38,257	26,100	27,200	36,479	38,209
4th Grade	26,200	27,600	36,982	38,929	27,100	28,200	36,789	38,727	24,500	25,700	34,978	36,698
3rd Grade	26,100	27,600	37,379	39,443	22,800	24,000	35,182	37,141	25,700	27,200	38,208	40,107
2nd Grade	23,000	24,400	35,292	37,465	26,900	27,200	38,277	40,603	23,500	24,600	37,581	39,638
1st Grade	26,600	28,200	40,842	43,743	25,600	27,500	39,319	42,128	26,000	27,700	40,042	42,638

$\frac{1}{1}$ All schools in the State.

TABLE 4
 DROPOUT RATES (HOLDING POWER) FOR TITLE I PROJECT SCHOOLS COMPARED
 WITH ALL SCHOOLS IN THE STATE

Grade	1963 - 1964		1964 - 1965		1965 - 1966	
	Title I Schools	<u>1/</u>	Title I Schools	<u>1/</u>	Title I Schools	<u>1/</u>
12th	7.6%	6.8%	7.4%	6.0%	5.6%	5.5%
11th	4.2%	6.3%	8.0%	6.0%	5.5%	5.0%
10th	5.0%	4.9%	6.7%	5.1%	5.8%	3.9%
9th	5.2%	2.2%	8.9%	1.7%	5.0%	1.7%
8th	5.7%	1.6%	4.2%	2.0%	4.0%	1.3%
7th	4.9%	1.5%	3.7%	1.8%	3.0%	1.2%
No. of Schools	537	582	540	586	536	583
Total No. of Students	305,600	424,300	307,500	426,700	309,900	429,200
No. of Dropouts	11,500	12,800	10,700	12,100	8,700	10,500

1/ All schools in the State.

TABLE 5

PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS IN TITLE I PROJECT HIGH SCHOOLS
CONTINUING EDUCATION BEYOND HIGH SCHOOL COMPARED WITH STATE NORM 1/

	If Possible 1963-1964		If Possible 1964-1965		If Possible 1965-1966	
	Title I Schools	1/ 19,200	Title I Schools	1/ 24,857	Title I Schools	1/ 24,600
TOTAL NUMBER OF GRADUATES	19,200	22,421	20,700	24,857	20,200	24,600
NUMBER OF SCHOOLS	487	507	490	511	486	508
MEAN SIZE OF GRADUATING CLASS	394	443	423	487	416	484
NUMBER OF SCHOOLS HAVING 3 -10% CONTINUING GRADS.	27	27	25	25	14	14
11-20%	56	56	23	23	26	26
21-30%	110	110	77	77	65	65
31-40%	73	78	112	114	116	118
41-50%	103	111	95	100	90	97
51-60%	64	64	86	93	67	70
61-99%	54	61	72	79	108	118

A student is considered to continue his education if he enters one of the following, on either a full or part-time basis: Post-Graduate High School Course, Junior College, College or University, a Vocational, Commercial, or Technical Institute, or a Nursing School.

1/ All schools in the State.

TABLE 6

RESULTS FOR MOST WIDELY USED TESTS FOR READING*

Grade Level	Month & Year Tested	Test Name	Form	N Schools	N Students	Raw Score X	Raw Score S. D.	Number of Students			
								25th %ile	50th %ile	75th %ile	99th %ile
2 - 12	Jan'66	Nelson Denny Reading	A	25	3056	52	11.35	907	747	819	613
1 - 9	Nov'65	California Reading Test	X	29	3935	60	2.46	1578	1042	742	593
1 - 6	Jan'66	Metropolitan Achievement (Reading)	A	24	1872	25	2.85	570	423	357	518

* Selected sample of 100 reports.

TABLE 7

(A) Group by project objectives (e.g. improve reading skills, improve nutritional level, improve first grade readiness, improve speech, improve chances of remaining in school) the five most commonly funded Title I projects in your State.

(B) Within each of the five categories in (A) analyse the most common approaches used to reach these objectives

I. To improve classroom performance in reading beyond usual expectations.

- a. Summer reading classes.
- b. Additional specialized staff.
- c. Teacher aides.
- d. In-service training programs for regular staff.
- e. Additional materials and equipment.

II. To improve the nutritional health of the children.

- a. Free noon meals.
- b. Additional equipment.
- c. Facilities
- d. Free breakfasts.
- e. Social workers

III. To change children's attitudes toward school and education.
(Counseling)

- a. Additional specialized staff.
- b. In-service training programs for new and unqualified staff members.

- c. Small group summer instructional programs.
- d. Additional and more appropriate materials and equipment.
- e. Updated and additional evaluation instruments.
- f. Field visits to educational institutions, (i.e. plants and offices).

IV. To improve children's verbal functioning and creativeness.

(Library Improvement)

- a. Additional specialized staff.
- b. Library aides.
- c. Additional materials and equipment.
- d. New and remodeled facilities.

V. To improve the physical health of the children.

- a. Examinations and treatment.
- b. School nurses.
- c. Food, clothing, and other basic needs.
- d. Physical education activities.

VI. To raise the child's cultural appreciation level.

- a. Music instructors.
- b. Art instructors.
- c. Field trips to cultural centers.
- d. Instructional materials.

TABLE 8
BASIC INFORMATION ON MAJOR INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES

	Reading	Mathematics	Speech	Physical Education	Special Education	Cultural Enrichment	Guidance	Library	Summer School
Total Number Participants	37,200	4,000	860	15,100	1,570	12,500	24,000	66,000	25,600
Total Number Professional Staff	565	56	22	57	67	42	85	89	1,341
Total Salaries	\$1,610,000	\$215,000	\$ 98,000	\$140,000	\$280,000	\$190,000	\$310,000	\$ 320,000	\$ 970,000
Total Cost	\$3,580,000	\$420,000	\$121,000	\$293,000	\$360,000	\$308,000	\$421,000	\$1,175,000	\$1,550,000
Average Cost Per Participant	\$96.20	\$105.00	\$141.00	\$19.40	\$229.00	\$24.60	\$17.50	\$17.80	\$60.50

TABLE 9
BASIC INFORMATION ON MAJOR SERVICE ACTIVITIES

	Lunches	Breakfasts	Vision	Hearing	Dental	Medical	Clothing	Textbooks & Supplies
TOTAL NUMBER PARTICIPANTS	75,000	3,790	4,500	380	7,450	13,450	29,700	26,000
TOTAL COST	\$1,710,000	\$69,600	\$161,000	\$28,600	\$251,000	\$222,000	\$498,000	\$229,000
TOTAL NUMBER EXAMINED			41,000	35,000	21,000	42,000		
TOTAL NUMBER TREATED			4,500	380	7,450	13,450		
TOTAL NUMBER MEALS SERVED	5,000,000	305,000						
AVERAGE COST PER PARTICIPANT	\$23.00	\$18.00	\$36.00	\$15.00	\$33.50	\$16.50	\$17.00	\$9.00

TABLE 10

STAFF DATA REPORT

	EMPLOYED		REGULAR STAFF PAID FOR EXTRA HOURS	NO. PARTICIPANTS IN IN-SERVICE	UNFILLED POSITIONS
	FULL TIME	PART TIME			
Project Director	12	14	16	29	5
Remedial Reading	122	143	69	1435	41
Remedial Math	34	22	22	682	6
Remedial (other)	55	131	11	507	9
Special Education	60	7	3	580	22
Guidance and Counseling	60	25	12	183	22
Speech Correction	13	4	3	217	10
Physical Education	35	22	1	413	2
Librarian	63	21	15	149	24
Librarian Aide	53	26		2	3
Nurse	63	13	1	20	13
Attendance	10	19	6	6	1
Social Worker	72	32	8	11	3
Teacher Aide	424	89	5	27	9
Secretary	135	76	34	6	5
Accountant/Bookkeeper	20	29	16	7	
Pre-School	37	20	2	86	
Summer School	989	352	193	191	
Other (specify)					
Supervisors	14	7	2		
Cultural Enrichment	34	8	10		11
Evaluation			26		

Number unpaid volunteers 1006

STATE TITLE I STAFF

William H. Moore, Associate Commissioner for Federal Programs

Clarence E. Morris, Title I Supervisor with Special Assignment
of OEO Coordinator

Leon L. Wilson, Title I Supervisor with Special Assignment of
Evaluation of Title I

Billy Ray Pate, Title I Supervisor with Special Assignment of
Title III Coordinator

B. G. Williams, Title I Supervisor

Ben F. Lever, Title I Supervisor

Eugene Channel, Title I Supervisor

Olen W. Taylor, Title I Fiscal Officer

Sue Short, Assistant Supervisor to Title I Evaluator

Sally Boyd, Assistant Supervisor to Title I Fiscal Officer

Earl S. Glover, Assistant Supervisor to Title I Fiscal Officer

Mildred McKnelly, Personal Secretary to Mr. Moore

Dorothy McKinstry, Secretary to Mr. Morris and Mr. Williams

Gloria King, Secretary to Mr. Wilson and Mr. Lever

Maurine Newman, Secretary to Mr. Pate and Mr. Channel

Kathy Horton, Secretary to Mr. Taylor

Helen Bettis, Bookkeeper

Virginia Whitman, Fiscal Technical Assistant

Billie Wilson, Receptionist

Mary Wilson, Reproductionist and Clerk


The information in this report was collected, compiled, analyzed
and prepared by:

Miss Sue Short

Mrs. Gloria King

Mr. Leon L. Wilson

Respectfully submitted by:



Leon L. Wilson
Supervisor of Evaluation