DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 021 902 UD 004 440

DELAWARE ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT, ESEA TITLE I-FY '66.

Delaware State Dept. of Public Instruction, Dover.
Pub Date 30 Nov 66
Note- 47p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.96
Descriptors- ACHIEVEMENT TESTS, ATTENDANCE, *COMPENSATORY EDUCATION PROGRAMS, *DISADVANTAGED YOUTH, DROPOUT RATE, *FEDERAL PROGRAMS, HIGHER EDUCATION, MEASUREMENT INSTRUMENTS, PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION, PROGRAM COSTS, *PROGRAM EVALUATION, READING TESTS, SCHOOL SERVICES, STAFF UTILIZATION, STATISTICAL DATA, STUDENT IMPROVEMENT, TEST RESULTS
Identifiers- California Lower Primary Battery, Delaware, Esea Title 1, Metropolitan Achievement Tests, Sequential Tests of Educational Progress, Stanford Achievement Tests

This report is an evaluation of the compensatory education activities in Delaware funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The material is arranged according to the format stipulated by the U.S. Office of Education. In Section I the administrative aspects of the program are described and the pupils' performance on a number of standardized achievement tests is reported. Section II contains data on program activities and methods, pupil enrollment, and program costs. Section III is made up of tabular data on test results, attendance, program effectiveness, dropout rate, students continuing their education beyond high school, and commonly funded projects and approaches. (LB)

DELAWARE

ANNUAL EVALUATION

REPORT

ESEA TITLE I - FY '66

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 (including city visits, regional conferences, consultants, data processing, etc.)

The State Educational Agency has provided the following services to Local Educational Agencies:

(a) Consultant services to assist local district personnel in the correct and timely preparation of project proposals.

(b) Several county workshops have been held for Chief School Officers and Title I Directors to review instructions and guidelines for submitting proposals.

(c) All records can be audited at the State Agency since a record of all purchase orders, invoices and payroll is kept at the State level. Data processing Division provides much of this service.

(d) Monthly meetings for persons responsible for operational projects have been planned.

(e) Coordinator and Advisory Committee members have made many personal visits to projects.

2. DISSEMINATION:

(a) Describe how local projects are disseminating data--
(1) to other local agencies
(2) to the State agency

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

All services provided to LEA's were provided for other state agencies eligible under 89-313.

(a) (1) Information after evaluation to be disseminated by the state agency to other LEAs.
(2) Local agencies make monthly progress reports to the State agency.

(b) The State Agency is now reviewing all evaluations from local agencies and will disseminate information on promising educational practices in the following manner:

Special county meetings for Title I directors.
Newsletter now being planned.
Brochure illustrating what was accomplished in Title I Programs during Fiscal '66.

3. EVALUATION:

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

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

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

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

Number of Projects	Evaluation Design
	Two group experimental design using the project group and a conveniently available non-project group as the control.
	One group design using a pretest and post-test on the project group to compare observed gains or losses with expected gains.
	One group design using pretest and/or post-test scores on the project group to compare observed performance with local, State or national groups.
	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.
	One group design using test data on the project group, but no comparison data.
	Other (specify)

(a) The implementation of the ESEA, Title I program in the State of Delaware has been the cause not only for a considerable flow of both directory and advisory literature to local agencies from the State Department of Public Instruction, but has also seen a considerable amount of personal advice and support in both the conduct and evaluation of the program. Direction toward and assistance in evaluation has been an integral part of the innumerable visits to local projects during their conduct and in-office meetings with various supervisory personnel of the local education agencies, as is evidenced by the extent of the listing of names of state personnel involved in providing evaluation assistance, below.

In addition to the federally published literature which was transmitted to the local education agencies, the Department of Public Instruction starting in September, 1965 reproduced pertinent federal literature for distribution to the local agencies and commenced publication of memos, outlines and guidelines for the benefit of the local agencies. Initially under the leadership of the Director of Teacher Education and Professional Standards Division and later under two successive full-time ESEA Title I Coordinators with the advice and support of the 15-member state advisory committee for ESEA Title I, appointed and actively supported by the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, a state guideline titled "Delaware Guidelines, Special Programs for Educationally Deprived Children" was prepared in November, 1965 and published and distributed for the benefit of the local agencies. This publication gave the direction for later evaluation.

The Delaware guidelines called for clear statement of assumptions underlying the project and relative to the objectives of the program asked that a primary statement of the project be specific and state in operational terms or in terms of child behavior. Describe behavior; not label. For example: 'To improve listening skills' is more behavioral than 'to assist children to listen better.' The first is child oriented and is measurable, the second is teacher oriented. All primary objectives should be such as can and will be evaluated in some valid form during and at the conclusion of the project. If standardized and objective measures are not available, it may be desirable to design a local method or instrument. Help in this area will be available from the State Department of Public Instruction." Guidelines went on to describe specific evaluation procedures and problems, calling first of all for the local agencies to "present evaluation plans as matched items with primary objectives. Cross reference." Guidelines go to ask in planning for evaluating progress of children "how do you plan to establish the baseline date on the achievement of the participants? Do you plan to evaluate periodically for progress? If so, how? If subjective measures to be used, it is suggested careful, pertinent, anecdotal records be maintained on at least a weekly basis. Describe plans for post-testing. What specific test do you plan to use? By whom will they be administered?" Planning for evaluating process such as teaching techniques and special services for collecting and storing data for evaluating effectiveness of total project is also called for in these guidelines.

Although initially given a primary concern for the consideration of LEA proposals, the regular and special meetings of the ESEA Title I advisory committee gave considerable thought to evaluation procedures. Procedures were set up for visitations to local projects and preparing a check sheet for project review. Principally under the direction of the departmental data processing coordinator and the assistant supervisor for testing. Data handling methods were established for processing and summarizing the objective measurement instruments as they were to come in for the spring and then later for summer program evaluation reports. Toward the end of the program year joint

meetings of members of the state ESEA Title I advisory committee and representatives, coordinators, and directors of the local education agency projects met together in each of the counties in the state and for better than an hour at each of these meetings discussed the most effective final evaluation procedures to be used.

The state testing office rendered considerable assistance to the local educational agencies conducting the program by assisting with the procurement of testing materials, by frequently processing these materials and reporting the results back to the districts. Concurrently many members of the advisory committee on visits to the schools or in response to telephone calls or in-person inquiries in their offices gave direct assistance to the coordinators and staffs of the local projects in the preparation of their final evaluation reports for 1965-66.

(b) State Personnel involved in providing evaluation assistance:

Randall Aungst, Assistant Supervisor, Teacher Education
Helen Bennett, Supervisor, Library
Martha Bonar, Supervisor, School Lunch
Bruce Brigham, Supervisor, Reading
Audrey Doberstein, Coordinator, ESEA Title I
Richard French, Coordinator, Speech and Hearing
D. Russell Friend, Coordinator, Data Processing
Paul Johnston, Assistant Supervisor, Research and Publications
Jane Kenton, Test Scoring Operator
Elizabeth Lloyd, Director, Teacher Certification
Alan Maloney, Assistant Supervisor, Testing
Ruth Laws, Supervisor, Vocational-Technical Research
Ann Miller, Test Processing Clerk
Marian Miller, Assistant Supervisor of Testing
Virginia Neaves, Supervisor, Elementary Education
Mildred Snowberger, Supervisor, Home Economics
Paul Stitik, Coordinator, Federal Programs
Wilmer Wise, Director, Research and Publications
Joyce Winder, Coordinator, ESEA Title I

(c) Consultants involved in providing evaluation assistance to the State:

Jack Hallman, Reading Supervisor, Newark Special School District
Daniel McKenney, Office of Economic Opportunity
Lorin Hunt, Office of Economic Opportunity
Samuel Cronis, Delaware Department of Health
University of Delaware Reading Study Center

(d) Evaluation Designs

1. Two group experimental design using the project group and a conveniently available non-project group as the control.-0

2. One group design using a pre-test and post-test on the

project group to compare observed gains or losses with expected gains.-27

3. One group design using pre-test and/or post-test scores on the project group to compare observed performance with local, state or national groups.-29

4. 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.-0

5. One group design using test data on the project group, but no comparison data.-12

6. Other - staff opinion, structured and/or un-structed.-32

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, (2) Operation and Service, (3) Evaluation, (4) Other.

(b) Describe any suggestions or recommendations for revising the legislation in order to alleviate these problems.

(1) Reviewing proposals - The State Advisory Committee plan for reviewing project proposals seemed to work exceptionally well. These state supervisors are familiar with a great variety of areas and were able to offer many suggestions and recommendations to local agencies.

Our greatest problem was the shuffling back and forth of the proposal between the committee and the LEA for corrections and revisions. Another cause for concern was the time element involved. In Delaware, a project cannot be approved and become operational until the district receives definite allocation.

The State Budget Commission will not approve a project until the money is allocated to the State and in turn to the local agency. If allocations could be made in the spring for the next school year, it would greatly relieve the problem of getting projects operational as expediently as possible.

(2) Operation and Service - The shortage of State supervisory personnel was our greatest problem in providing service to the operational projects. Some State supervisors have to act as consultant to as many as six projects and as a result cannot make the personal contacts deemed advisable.

(3) Evaluation - The major problem in the area of evaluation

was collecting necessary data "after the fact". All approved projects had objective evaluation plans but many were not set up to collect the type of data requested.

(4) Other - The problem of getting projects operational by the beginning of the school year is one of our greatest concerns. If schools are to employ qualified personnel to staff these programs they must have an approved program before September 1.

Recommendations

(b) The problem indicated in #3 could be alleviated by an increase in the 75,000 minimum administrative item. In states like Delaware where all LEA audits can be done in the State agency, a large portion of this budget must of necessity be allocated to the Finance Division and Data Processing.

The evaluation problem could be alleviated if the state agency was informed at least 6 months in advance as to what data was requested for final evaluation. The state agency in turn could request local agencies to collect desired information while the project was operational.

The problem illustrated under #4 could be alleviated if allocations were made to each state in the early spring for FY '68.

5. IMPLEMENTATION OF SECTION 205

(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. (This may include projects that were revised substantially and then approved.)

(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.

(a) Twenty-seven out of thirty of these projects were in area of Language Arts.

a. Stereotyped projects (more "of the same thing" that had already failed.)
b. Ineffective instructional approaches.
c. Projects based on misconceptions caused by assumptions.
d. Projects involving too many students.
e. Poor plans for in-service development.
f. Insufficient understanding of "concentration of effort".
g. Overemphasis of material.

(b) Misconception of general aid.

a. Included too many children - difficulty in understanding "concentration of effort".
b. Confusion regarding the separate "economic" and "educational" criteria.
c. Reluctance to accept the necessity of documentation of objective, organized and broad based planning efforts.
d. Misconception that Title I funds can be used to purchase equipment and materials for general school use.

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.

(b) Total amount of Title I money approved for LEA's where there is an approved Community Action Program.

(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. (include relationship with State Technical Assistance Agency.)

(d) Describe the successes in securing Community Action Agency - Local Education Agency cooperation.

(e) Describe the problems in securing Community Action Agency - Local Education Agency cooperation.

(f) 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.

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

(a) Approximately 6.

(b) During FY '66 the state agency considered each county CAA as having an approved program. Therefore, this figure would be the total state allocation of 8,855,500.

(c) The State Coordinator of CEO and his deputy assistant are members of the State Advisory Committee. As members of this committee they have opportunities to make suggestions and recommendations for each project proposal.

Every local educational agency is required to include a local community action representative in the planning of the project. A record of this planning must be sumitted with Parts I and II of the application.

(d) In a few communities where LEA's have planned to conduct pre-school programs with Title I funds these efforts have

been successfully coordinated and in most cases CAA groups are very willing to conduct day care or other programs.

(e) 1. Many LEA's had difficulty contacting the person assigned by the county office.
2. In many cases CAA persons resented the fact that school administrators had assessed the characteristics and needs of these children and presented plans that were in written form.
3. In several instances CAA persons demanded a series of meetings involving many persons - this might have delayed the project approval for several months.
4. In some cases suggestions from CAA personnel could not be incorporated into the project because of state educational regulations. i.e. - use of aides in the classroom; many differences in qualification standards. CAA persons in many instances would suggest lowering educational standards in order to provide jobs for persons from low income background.

(f) There was very little or no instances where the two acts reinforced each other since the vast majority of Title I projects were conducted during the school day with school age children.

(g) The recommendation from the State agency and from Local Education agencies in Delaware are that this CAA requirement must be stricken from the law. We strongly believe that local agencies can be encouraged by the Department of Public Instruction to involve the community in planning some Title I programs.

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

(b) Title III

(c) Title IV

(d) Title V
(Include specific examples)

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

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

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

(a) Title II - No direct use of funds in relation to this Title.

(b) Title III - No direct use of funds in relation to this Title.

(c) Title IV - No direct use of funds in relation to this Title.

(d) Title V - There have been concerted efforts to develop and mobilize available resources into an effective, coordinated attack on problems that are unique to the operation of Title I programs. Most SEA activities, under Title V, have been directed toward supplying special supervisory, consultant and leadership services to the local school agencies.

(e) Successes in developing and implementing projects relating Title I with other Titles of ESEA.

(1) State supervisory personnel have been involved in planning and have provided consultative services in the carrying out of LEA projects.

(2) Data processing equipment funded from Title V has begun to be used for processing of evaluation data of the Title I projects.

(f) Problem areas involved in relating Title I with other Titles of ESEA:

(1) Limited ESEA funds, principally due to size and wealth of state.

(2) Delays in installation of data processing equipment funded from Title V.

(3) Inadequate time for proper coordination under state leadership. This particular problem is being rectified for FY '67, initially by a series of statewide conferences with project directors.

8. COOPERATIVE PROJECTS BETWEEN DISTRICTS:

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

(b) Describe the problem areas involved in developing and implementing cooperative projects between two or more districts.

(c) Describe any suggestions or recommendations for revising the legislation concerning cooperative projects between districts.

(a) The seven cooperative projects, with respective student populations, were:
John M. Clayton (1693) and Frankford (265)
Dover (4520) and Little Creek (28)
Felton (1031) and Frederica (317)
Marshallton (2909) and John M. Dickinson (1425)

Middletown 60 (1253), Middletown 120 (476) and Townsend (415)
Milford (2882) and Ellendale (247)
Selbyville 32 (563) and Selbyville 120 (199)

The first, fifth and seventh of the above named cooperative projects have merged subsequent to starting their projects. In addition, the projects of Millsboro 23 and Millsboro 204 were jointly and cooperatively evaluated, the districts also having merged. The Seaford project, not herein listed as a cooperative one, involved a new merger, and the program was specifically aimed at alleviating the problems anticipated with the Seaford integration with the Blades district.

Thus, cooperative action was present in the case of five districts which were a recent or immediately pending product of mergers, and all evidence indicates that the cooperation of the eleven districts (by pre-merger count) greatly facilitated the recent or pending mergers, which typically involved a question of racial integration. The most remarkable comments related to the teacher attitudes, which were reported as enhanced, insofar as desegration was concerned, by the cooperative conduct of the ESEA Title I programs. There was no way for objective evaluation of the benefits of cooperative programs for the children involved, but common opinion pointed out that the reduced administrative expenditure per child and the supplementary staff and services made possible both enhanced the projects over and above what the individual districts would have been able to plan for and provide on their own.

(b) No remarkable problem areas were reported or observed. Transportation presented a minor problem, but in only one of the seven cooperative projects. Racial desegration was noted to have presented less of a problem than was anticipated, and considerably less so than was feared would be were it to take place during the regular school program (lacking the intensive staffing and direction of the Title I programs.) There were no reported difficulties in inter-district relations.

(c) None. Within existing legislation, state policy is tending toward greater encouragement of cooperative projects, especially between smaller districts or those with allocations too small for effectiveness but having neighbors able to finance cooperative administration.

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?

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

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

(d) Describe any suggestions or recommendations for revising the

legislation concerning public and non-public school participation.

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

Services or Activities in which children attending schools participated:	No. of projects	*No. of non-public school children participating
1. On public school grounds only:		
During the regular school day		
Before School		
After School		
Weekends		
Summer		
2. On non-public school grounds only:		
During the regular school day		
Before School		
After School		
Weekends		
Summer		
3. On both public and non-public school grounds:		
During the regular school day		
Before School		
After School		
Weekends		
Summer		
4. On other than public or non-public school grounds:		
During the regular school day		
Before School		
After School		
Weekends		
Summer		

* The figure is not expected to be an unduplicated count of children.

(a) 1. Proposals must state what efforts have been taken to coordinate project with officials of non-public schools.

2. Both public and non-public school officials are being informed of alternative possibilities for cooperative or inclusive projects.

(b) Ten projects have included non-public school children (N-1732) in their programs. Generally increased communication between public and non-public school personnel has been a general by-product of the Title I cooperation.

(c) 1. Planning time was the greatest problem in implementing as well as planning public and non-public school cooperation

in Title I programs during Fiscal 1966.

2. Time in the school day presented a significant problem, especially in relation to transportation. This was not a problem in summer programs.

3. Understanding of the residence, as opposed to enrollment, aspect of the cooperative arrangements under the Federal guidelines was only slowly clarified, and did hinder further cooperation during Fiscal 1966.

(d) None. Broader implentation of the cooperation of non-public schools with public school Title I projects is quite possible within the present law.

(e) NOTE that omissions indicate a zero count!

	Public Grounds		Public & Non-public Grounds	
Schedule	Proj.	Child.	Projects	Children
Regular School Day	1	5		
			Regular Term & Summer	
Summer	8	193	1	1539
Total	9	198	1	1539

Addenda to Part I, Section 9 (a)

Regular School Day - Public Grounds: Stanton (5)
Summer - Public Grounds: Claymont (2), Georgetown (2), New Castle (22), Dover (106), Richardson Park (39), Rehoboth (2), CAesar Rodney(10), Millsboro (5).
Regular School Day and Summer - Public and Non-Public Grounds: Wilmington (1539)
Counts are unduplicated. No programs were conducted other than in categories above.
Total enrollment of non-public school students represents 8.5% of enrollment in the state; public school students participating in Title I programs, for comparison, represent 9.3% of the total public school enrollment in the state.

10. SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS

(a) If your State has printed State guidelines or disseminated other publications for implementing Title I programs, please enclose 5 copies of each.

(b) If your State has contracted for evaluations of Title I programs or if LEA's have contracted with outside agencies for such evaluations, please enclose 5 copies of each.

(c) Submit a compilation of objective measurements of educational attainment for programs funded under Title I. (For example, a table of pre and post-test scores for a group of projects having similar objectives and using the same standardized instrument and given at similar times.)

(d) Continue to supply complete data on the previously submitted ten per cent sample of approved fiscal 1966 grants.

(a) See attached.

(b) Not applicable.

(c) Compilation of objective measurements of educational attainment for programs funded under Title I:

The Delaware ESEA Title I projects during fiscal year 1965-1966 were predominantly based upon an objective of improving reading skills; hence, objective measurements center about reading comprehension. Other language tests represent a measure of closely related aspects while the several arithmetic tests which are included are considered relevant primarily in that school learned arithmetic skills and especially school learned test performance on arithmetic tests are based upon a facility in language.

California Lower Primary Battery:

Comprehension Sub-Tests - 105 first and second grade students in one school district during a pre and post-test period of 0.24 years increased their mean grade equivalent on this sub-test from grade 1.6 to grade 1.8. The growth was 0.2 years, 83% of the normative growth grade.

Vocabulary Sub-tests - 125 students in first and second grade in one school district went from a mean grade equivalent of 1.5 to 1.8 years, a growth of 0.1 years or 42% of normative growth.

Language Sub-tests - 125 students in first and second grade in one school district went from a mean grade equivalent of 1.7 to 1.8 years, a growth of 0.1 years or 42% of normative growth.

Arithmetic Concept Sub-tests - 125 students in first and second grades in one school district went from a mean grade equivalent of 1.7 to 2.2, a growth of 0.48 years or 200% of normative growth.

Arithmetic Computation Sub-tests - 108 students in first and second grades in one school district went from a mean grade equivalent of 1.41 to 1.69, a growth of 0.28 years or 117% of normative growth.

Gates Primary Reading Tests:

Word Recognition Sub-Tests - 167 students in grades ranging from one through six from six school districts during a mean pre and post-test period of .09 months, the range of these periods being from 1.1 months to 3.0 months, affected a mean pre-test grade equivalent of 2.36, a mean post-test grade equivalent of 2.49; the pre to post-test growth of 0.13 years is 144% of normative growth.

Sentence Meaning Sub-tests - 156 students in first through sixth grades from four of the six districts cited above under the Word Recognition Sub-Tests, during a mean pre to post-test period of 0.10 years went from a mean grade equivalent 2.15 to 2.20; the increase of 0.05 years for pre to post-test represents 50% of normative growth.

Paragraph Meaning Sub-Tests - 129 students from seven school districts, their grades ranging from one through six, during a mean pre to post-test period of 0.12 years went from a grade equivalent of 2.17 to 2.34; the pre to post growth of 0.17 years is 142% of the normative growth.

Gates Reading Survey:

Comprehension Sub-Tests - 928 students in grades two through twelve, from nine school districts, during a mean pre-test to post-test period of 0.25 years went from a mean grade equivalent to 2.98 on the pre-test to 4.22 on the post-test. The mean growth of 0.24 years is 96% of the normative growth.

Vocabulary Sub-tests - 136 students in grades two through twelve from five school districts during a mean pre to post-test period of 0.25 years went from a mean grade equivalent of 4.78 to 5.33. The mean growth of 0.55 years is 220% of normative growth.

Iowa Tests of Basic Skills:

Reading Sub-tests - 116 students in grades three through six in two school districts, during a mean pre to post-test period of 0.11 years went from a mean grade equivalent of 3.44 to 3.47; the growth of 0.03 years is 27% of normative growth.

Vocabulary Sub-Tests - The same 116 students in grades three through six in two school districts during the pre to post-test period of 0.11 years went from a mean grade equivalent on this sub-test of 3.54 to 3.67; the mean pre to post-test growth of 0.13 years is 118% of normative growth.

Lee Clark Reading Tests:

First Reader Level - 215 students in first and second grades in one school district during a two month or 0.17 year pre to post-test period went from a mean grade equivalent of 1.79 to 2.0; the pre to post-test growth of 0.21 year is 123% of normative growth.

Lorge Thorndike Intelligence Tests - While this intelligence test and a number of other similar instruments were administered during the course of the 1965-66 ESEA Title I programs in Delaware, only 56 of the participating students were administered a standard intelligence or aptitude test on a pre-test and post-test basis. The sample which took the Lorge

Thorndike this way was only nine students, all in one school district. The mean I.Q. went from 97.0 on the pre-test to 98.9 on the post-test for this extremely limited sample. Results for the WISC which are below show movement in the opposite direction. That the pre to post changes on both the Lorge Thorndike and the WISC are both well within the differences which can be attributed statistically to chance. It should be noted at this time that considerably greater numbers of students will be involved in pre and post intelligence or aptitude testing during the course of the 1966-67 ESEA Title I programs in Delaware and it is considered that the samples will be large enough and sufficiently well distributed to test the hypothesis that performances on such tests could be expected to show growth greater than that represented by chronological age, due to the nature of the programs.

Metropolitan Achievement Tests Primary II Level:

Reading Sub-Tests - 36 second grade students in one school district during a three month or 0.25 year period from pre to post-test went from a mean grade equivalent of 2.0 to 2.1; the growth of 0.1 years is 40% of normative growth.

Spelling Sub-Tests - The same 36 second grade students from one district went from a mean grade equivalent of 1.9 to 2.0; the growth of 0.1 years again is 40% of normative growth.

Metropolitan Achievement Tests Elementary Level:

Reading Sub-Tests - 137 students in grades three through six from three school districts during a mean pre to post-test period of 0.27 years went from a mean grade equivalent of 2.51 to 2.80; the growth of 0.29 years is 107% of normative growth.

Spelling Sub-Tests - 82 of the same students, these being in grades three and four from two school districts, during a like pre to post-test period of 0.27 years went from a mean grade equivalent of 2.92 to 3.03; the growth of 0.11 years is 41% of normative growth.

Arithmetic Concept Sub-Tests - 79 students in grades three and four of one school district, all of whom had taken the above two sub-tests, during a pre to post-test period of 0.25 years went from a mean grade equivalent to 3.26 to 3.32; the growth of 0.06 years is 24% of normative growth.

Sequential Tests of Educational Progress:

Reading Sub-Tests - 171 students in grades four through ten in two school districts during a mean pre to post-test period of 0.28 years achieved a mean pre-test converted score of 245, a mean post-test converted score of 248, the normative mean score for grade four on this sub-test being 244 and for grade five 252.

It can, by interpolation, be considered that the mean grade equivalent for the 171 students went from 4.1 to 4.5. This interpolated growth of 0.4 years is 143% of the interpolated normative growth.

Listening Sub-Tests - 136 students in grades four through ten in one school district during a mean pre to post-test period of 0.41 years went from a mean converted score on the pre-test of 258 to a mean post-test converted score of 263. It should be noted that this sub-test, while requiring a modest degree of reading ability for the most effective performance, measures a school nurtured skill which is clearly prerequisite to effective partaking of instruction. By equating the converted scores to the published grade level norm it can be said that these 136 students went from a mean grade equivalent of slightly below 4.0 to 5.0. This growth of slightly better than 1.0 years is 244% of normative growth.

Science Research Associates Achievement Series:

Mathmematics Sub-Tests - 55 students in grades one through seven from one school district during a pre to post-testing period of one month or 0.08 years went from a mean grade equivalent of 4.03 to 4.53. The measured growth of 0.50 years during the 0.08 year period represents a rate 625% of normative growth.

Stanford Achievement Tests Primary I Level:

Paragraph Meaning Sub-Tests - 65 students in grades one and two from three school districts during a mean pre to post-testing period of 0.18 years went from a mean grade equivalent 1.62 to 1.72; the growth of 0.10 years is 55% of normative growth.

Word Reading Sub-Tests - the same 65 first and second grade students from three school districts went from a mean pre-test grade equivalent of 1.58 to a mean post-test grade equivalent of 1.70; the growth of 0.12 years is 67% of normative growth.

Vocabulary Sub-Tests - the same 65 first and second grade students from three school districts achieved pre and post-test grade equivalents of 1.66 and 1.78 respectively. The growth of 0.12 years during the 0.18 year pre to post-testing period again is a growth rate 67% of normative.

Stanford Achievement Tests Primary II Level:

Paragraph Meaning Sub-Tests - 53 students in grades two through four from two school districts during a pre to post-test period averaging 0.17 years went from a pre-test mean grade equivalent of 2.41 to a post-test of 2.42. This measured growth of 0.01 years is 6% of normative.

Word Reading Sub-Tests - 52 second through fourth grade students from two school districts, substantially the same students

as in the case of the Paragraph Meaning sub-tests, measured a very slight decline from pre to post-tests. The grade equivalent change was from 2.60 to 2.58 with substantially the same students involved. A similar lowering of mean grade equivalents noted on the Language and the Spelling Sub-Tests of this battery as administered in these two school districts.

Stanford Achievement Tests Intermediate I Level:

Paragraph Meaning Sub-Tests - 59 students in grades four through six in three school districts, during a mean pre and post period of 0.18 year, went from a mean grade equivalent of 3.49 on the pre-test to 3.64 on the post-test. This growth of 0.15 years is 83% of normative growth. Word meaning sub-test - the same 59 in grades four through six, from three school districts, during the same pre-post testing period, mean grade equivalent of 3.65 to 3.85 on this subject. The growth of 0.20 years was 111% of normative growth.

Spelling Sub-Tests - the same 59 fourth through sixth grade students, from three school districts, regressed from pre to post-testing. The respective mean grade equivalents were 4.12 and 3.98.

Language Sub-Tests - 46 of the aforementioned 59 students, likewise being from grades four through six, but from two of the three school districts, went from a pre-test mean grade equivalent of 2.94 to a post-test mean grade equivalent of 3.17. The measured growth on this sub-test, which is a measure of knowledge of capitalization, punctuation, and correct usage, averaged 0.23 years, 115% of normative growth.

Stanford Achievement Tests - Intermediate II Level - Paragraph Meaning Sub-Test 28 students in grades five and six from two school districts, during a pre-post testing period 0.25 years, achieved the same mean grade equivalent scores on the pre and post-tests; 4.40.

Word Meaning Sub-Tests - 29 students in fifth and sixth grades in two school districts, including the 28 involved in the preceding sub-test report, during a mean pre to post-testing period of 0.25 years, went from a pre-test mean grade equivalent to 4.18 to a post-test of 4.31. The growth of 0.13 years is 52% of normative growth.

Spelling Sub-Test - 28 students from fifth and sixth grades in two school districts, during a mean pre to post-testing period of 0.25 years, went from a mean grade equivalent of 4.55 on the pre-test to 4.66 on the post-test. The growth of 0.11 years is 44% of normative growth.

Stanford Achievement Tests - Advanced level - Paragraph Meaning Sub-test 17 seventh and eighth grade students in one school district went, in a pre to post-test period of 0.25 years, from a mean grade equivalent of 6.16 on the pre-test to 7.36 on the post-test. The growth of 1.2 years during this three month program is

480% of normative growth. Growth for the same 17 students on the language sub-test was 12% of normative, on the spelling sub-test 28% of normative.

Wide Range Achievement Tests - Reading sub-test, 94 students in grades one through six from three school districts, during a mean pre to post-testing period of 0.28 years, went from a mean grade equivalent of 3.86 to 4.27. The measured growth of 0.41 years is 140% of normative growth.

Spelling Sub-Tests - 57 of the above mentioned 94 students, these however from two of the three school districts, during a mean pre to post-testing period of 0.36 years went from a mean grade equivalent of 2.61 to 2.85. The growth of 0.24 years is 67% of normative growth for this sub-test.

Arithmetic Sub-Tests - 79 students in grade one through six from three school districts, the 79 all being included in the 94 which took the reading sub-test, above, during a mean pre to post-testing period of 0.31 years went from a mean grade equivalent of 4.5 to 4.85. The growth of 0.40 years measured by this sub-test is 129% of normative growth.

Weschsler Intelligence Scale for Children - 47 students in grades one through six from one school district took this test. At the beginning and end of the five month program in the district, a statistical regression was noted in the total I.Q.'s, the mean I.Q. of the pre-test having been 87.8 for the post-test 84.4.

(d) Introduction

A sample of the approved projects in Delaware was not undertaken prior to the end of fiscal 1966; it has been since assumed that Delaware had not been advised to maintain complete data on a sample due to the small size of the state. Indeed, one could consider Delaware, with respect to ESEA Title I, as a microcosm of the nation, as indeed was suggested in a recent research report on Operation Headstart.

Selection of a sample at this time has been made to reflect in part the microcosmic nature of the state. Variety in Title I programs cannot be sampled - all projects but one in the spring and another in the summer were centered around reading programs, with differences of technique and effectiveness rather than of intent or primary objective. This, then, is the selection made after the fact:

Dover, Delaware - the spring program only, involving 525 students in a program characterized by educational idealism in an atmosphere clearly innovative. The district is in center state, the state capitol as a matter of fact, and includes a varied community of less than 10,000 population, rural environs which contain an admixture of suburbia and antebellum plantation life, and a large military installation to round out the heterogeneity.

Greenwood, Delaware - a summer program, involving 81 school children in a sincere and capably conducted program using current but tried methods and materials. The district is southwest of center state, and is comprised of a small rural community which hardly causes a slowdown of traffic on the four lane north-south highway it abuts, and a surrounding rural area rich in soybeans and the sweat of migrant and other hired labor.

Mount Pleasant School District - a spring program involving 12 ninth graders retarded one or more years in reading. The district is lily-white suburbia, to no one's fault, situated north of the city line of Wilmington, Delaware.

Seaford, Delaware - a summer program of primary stated intent unique in the state, involving 167 students who had just completed grades one through nine, inclusive, and coming after a February to June project under the same local administration, but centered about the common focus in the state of reading. The community, near the southwestern corner of the state, has a population of about 4,000 supported in part by the plant giving the citizens a claim to living in the "Nylon Capitol of the World", and partly by the commerce of the Florida bound travellers but more so by that of the rural area included in the district. Across the highway and the river from Seaford is the town of Blades, who school population, at least, has recently been involved in integration with the Seaford District - a fact which predicated the summer program.

1. Primary objective of program

Dover - General improvement of academic skills.
Greenwood - Improvement of reading and communication skills.
Mount Pleasant - Improvement of reading and communication skills.
Seaford - Development of feelings of acceptance and confidence.

2. Participants

Dover - 543, Grades 5 through 8
Greenwood - 81, Grades 1 through 6
Mount Pleasant - 12, Grade 9 only
Seaford - 167, Grades 1 through 9

Grade	Dover	Greenwood	Mount Pleasant	Seaford
1		15		18.6 (mean)
2		10		18.6
3		15		18.6
4		13		18.6
5	140	13		18.6
6	146	15		18.6
7	147			18.6
8	104			18.6
9			12	18.6
	543(?)	81	12	167

3. Staff

	Dover	Greenwood	Mount Pleasant	Seaford
Directors	1	-	-	1
Teachers	10	6	1	150
Teachers' Aides	20	-	1	3
Librarians	-	-	-	1
Library Aides	2	-	-	-
Guidance Counselors	-	-	-	-
Psychologists	-	-	-	-
Therapists	-	-	-	-
Nurses	-	-	-	-
Secretaries-Clerks	11	-	-	1
Cafeteria Workers	-	-	-	4
Custodial Workers	0.5	-	-	-
Technicians	1	-	-	-
Bus Drivers	-	-	-	3
	45.5	6	2	163

4. Attendance

Average Daily Attendance	218	75.1	11	162.5
Average Daily Membership	247	79.8	11	167
Percentage, Attendance/Membership	88%	94%	100%	97%
Percentage, District Wise	95%	96%	96%	95%

5. Methods used to meet objectives

Dover - For reading, experience stories, supervised library research, and SRA Reading Labs were the most common means; for writing improvement, the most remarkable technique was class-wide critique of individual compositions when projected for common viewing; for mathematics, instruction concentrated on basic concepts using such aids as the number line, fraction wheels, and geometric shapes. Generally, the instruction was corrective or remedial, as a supplement to the students' regular classroom work, and in fact often involved assistance with regular classroom homework assignments.

Greenwood - Reading instruction was organized around the Language Experience Approach, involving the writing of experience stories. Directed reading efforts were made in the higher elementary grades.

Mount Pleasant - Intensive small group work was the most remarkable characteristic of the methodology used; material uniquely appropriate for the group, inferentially considered a deviation from practice in this suburban district with a generally above average student body, and an open access classroom paperback library, greatly facilitated the instruction.

Seaford - The instruction for the students was based on experience enrichment; formal instructional methods were played down; classroom emphasis was upon practice in developed oral expression.

6. Supplementary methods

Three of the four districts, Dover being the exception, made extensive use of field trips for the purpose of cultural enrichment and as a means to enhance experiences. The extra attention, communication, and personal relations which were possible both on the field trips and in the small group situations which characterized the classrooms in all four of the projects constituted a methodology of its own. Dover reported, "...we have noticed growth in attitudes concerning self, more interest in cleanliness, and physical appearance as well as improvement scholastically."

Comments in the Greenwood report included, "...the children... became more anxious to succeed at their own rate and they worked in small groups with much more ease and confidence..... A very withdrawn student learned to participate in class and in school activities.....The speaking vocabulary and sentence structure of the students improved.....
Mount Pleasant reported as noteworthy success, "The anecdotal records of each of the participants indicate a need for encouragement and enhancement of self-image. By using small group techniques and appropriate curricular material, these students were able to succeed in a tangible way.....All of the professional participants were surprised at the extent of the situation engendered by trips. The students spontaneously discussed what they had seen....."
Seaford "made inroads" in the areas of "Participation in group activities....ease of communication....open, friendly attitude toward teachers....." Seaford, only, included training in health habits and treatment of visual, dental and medical problems as a supplementary part of the program.

7. Staff training

Dover - The Title I staff met regularly with the general facilities in the schools where the programs were taking place, and the report mentions some degree of response to the heightened awareness of the needs of the culturally deprived. A pre-session orientation of three days was adjudged insufficient; weekly meetings of Title I instructional teams with coordinators and the director were the heart of the in-service training program. The ongoing process of interchange among the "team" members - Title I teacher, two aides and clerk - and between them and the regular faculty, were perhaps the most effective continuing training, yet, in retrospect, the project report expresses a felt need for more preliminary training and even more ongoing communication.

Greenwood - A brief pre-program orientation was considered in

Mount Pleasant - While the short time between project approval and its start precluded hoped for workshops or other formal in-service training, the constant availability of two administrators, a coordinator, a consultant, a psychologist and two guidance counselors to the one teacher and one aide involved appears to have effectively provided support equivalent to in-service training.

Seaford - Concurrent to the work with the 167 students during the summer program, the entire faculty of the district was involved in in-service training aimed at general improvement of teaching of the culturally and educationally disadvantaged. One group of teachers were involved in a science workshop, where emphasis was partly upon updating the teachers' knowledge and degree of certainty in dealing with the subject matter, and partly upon the development and understanding of methods appropriate to the teaching of the disadvantaged - the central concept appears to have been teaching science as an openended process of investigation. A separate workshop for elementary teachers was concerned with reading, partly in the development of an informal reading inventory to assist the teachers in the diagnosis of students' difficulties, partly with methods for teaching word attack and mastery skills and building sight vocabulary, partly with creative writing techniques and finally with methods for fostering self-selective reading. A third workshop, in this case for the junior and senior high school teachers, was concerned with the relationship between the humanities and the culturally deprived, i.e., between "culture" in its two senses. Considerable emphasis in this last named workshop was given to defining the psychological and sociological characteristics of the culturally deprived student, and in sessions discussing the various aspects of "culture", art, communication, music and such were related to such children.

PART II

COMPREHENSIVE ANALYSIS

1. SCHOLASTIC EVALUATION

(1) SASA Class	(2) No. of LEA's w/project	(3) Funds Provided	(4) Children Enrl.	(5) --- Pri.-Sch.	(6) --- Non-Pub.	(7) --- Not Enr.	(8) Av. Cost Per Pupil (3)/(4)	(8a) Per Pupil Enrolled (3)/(5+6)
A	None							
B	1	$442,873.	25,133	3,288	1,539	20,306	$17.61	$091.00
C	11	186,031	40,758	1,204	63	48,486	2.73	107.36
D	19	745,121	35,717	3,643	125	31,950	20.86	197.80
E	1	35,010	220	125	0	96	159.27	280.32
Total	32	$1,359,135	110,828	8,259	1,727	100,857	$12.26	$136.11
89-313	1	approx.$78,975	649	504	0	145	$118.60	$152.73
Grand	33	$1,438,110	111,473	8,763	1,727	100,962	$ 12.88	$136.91

Wilmington School District 1

Class B District - Wilmington, Total allocation - $933,390
Class C Districts - Claymont, DeLaWarr, Canning Bedford, Marshall-Dickinson, Richardson Park, Stanton, Middletown 60-130-Townsend, Mount Pleasant, Newark, New Castle, Newport, Total allocation - $164,811
Class D Districts - Bridgeville, Caesar Rodney, Dover-Little Creek, Felton-Frederica, Georgetown, Greenwood, Harrington, John M. Clayton-Frankford, Laurel, Lewes, Milford-Ellendale, Millsboro 33-204, Milton, Rehoboth, Seaford, Selbyville 32-210, Smyrna, William Henry, William C. Jason, Total allocation - $305,840.
Class E District - Lincoln, Total allocation - $35,891.
89-313 Projects - Alfred I. duPont Institute, Emily P. Bissell Hospital, Meadowood School, Department of Mental Health (Delaware State Hospital at Farnhurst, Governor Bacon Health Center, Stokely Hospital for the Mentally Retarded). Total allocation, subject to amendment of D.M.H. figures, $104,111.
Total state enrollment (30 Sept. 66) - 127,492. Title I enrollment - 8.2% of total. (Total includes public and non-public school and 89-313 unit enrollments).

2. ESTABLISHING PROJECT AREAS:

List in rank order the most widely used methods for establishing project areas. (For example, census information, AFDC payments, health statistics, housing statistics, school surveys, etc.)

SASA Class A - None
SASA Class B - Wilmington School District boundaries.
SASA Class C - School district boundaries.
School surveys, including screening tests.
Inter-relationship of districts, including pending merger.

S.S.A. Class D - School district boundaries.
Inter-relationship of districts, including pending mergers.
S.S.A. Class E - School district boundaries.

3. [illegible]

Mark in check under and describe the most pressing pupil needs in your State (not those identified as such). (For example, inadequate command of language, poor health of the children, inadequate nutrition, speech defects, etc.)

S.S.A. Class A - none, i.e., no such districts.
S.S.A. Class B - Reading deficiencies. (Code items 11 and 12) (Per oe-37003 pg.6)
Inadequate communication skills. (Code item 22)
S.S.A. Class C - Reading deficiencies. (Code items 11 and 12)
Inadequate communication skills. (Code item 22)
Expectations of school failure. (Code item 34)
Emotional and social instability. (Code item 55)
S.S.A. Class D - Reading deficiencies (Code items 11 and 12)
Inadequate communication skills. (Code item 22)
Inadequate or low level non-verbal functioning (Code item 23)
Achievement below grade level in non-reading areas. (Code item 13)
Negative attitude toward school and education (Code item 32)

S.S.A. Class E - Reading and other academic deficiencies (Code items 11, 12,13)
Low level in both verbal and non-verbal functioning (Code items
Lack of clothing (code item 34) 22,23)
High absentee rate (Code item 42)
89-316 - Handicapped - Mentally retarded, hearing, speech handicaps (Codes 61,62,63,64)
General academic deficiencies (Code items 11, 12,13)
Ability deficiencies (Code items 21,22,23)
Negative self-image (Code item 31)

4. [illegible]

Indicate the principal problems local officials encountered in implementing [illegible]. (Be specific - for example, if lack of personnel is a problem, state what types of personnel).

S.S.A. Class A - none, i.e., no such districts.
S.S.A. Class B - Lack of certified reading and psychological personnel.
Delay in receiving supplies, especially considering late start of program.
S.S.A. Class C - Lack of certified reading and psychological personnel.
Lack of time for planning and preparation.
Lack of supplementary qualified personnel, as social workers.
Delay in receiving supplies, especially considering late start of program.
S.S.A. Class D - Severe lack of certified reading and psychological personnel.
Lack of supplementary qualified personnel, as social workers.
Lack of time for planning and preparation.
Lack of experience with appropriate instructional methods.
S.S.A. Class E - Shortage of certified reading and psychological personnel.
Lack of adequate consultative personnel or innovative supervision.

68-618 - Inadequate understanding of the intention of ESEA Title I.
Shortage of time for planning and consulting.

5. Instructional Needs:

Under the most prevalent type of activities funded.

SASA Class A - none, i.e., no such districts.
SASA Class B - Reading and communication skills program.
SASA Class C - Reading and communication skills programs.
Elementary guidance program, behavior oriented. (K-1)
SASA Class D - Reading and communication skills programs.
General improvement of academic skills, especially basic arithmetic.
Secondary guidance, attitude oriented.
SASA Class E - Reading and communication skills program.
68-618 - General improvement of academic instructional services.
General improvement of residential school services, including recreation.

6. Exemplary Projects:

In a position to do exciting and/or innovative projects or activities that [illegible] but the criteria for such classification [illegible] Title I project funds. (No criterion in selecting [illegible] that [illegible] other LEA's [illegible] Materials to Teachers in other districts.) Use [illegible] human interest materials or [illegible] Title I projects.

SASA Class A - none, i.e., no such districts.
SASA Class B - In the one district in this SASA Class, several aspects of the program were considered as exemplary. The Wilmington program, although primarily oriented toward improvement of reading and communication skills, made effective use of the license staffing and augmented materials supplying made possible by Title I funding. The two aspects which stood out as especially remarkable were:

1. Use of child development assistants on the elementary level for counselling with the boys and girls and with their families, with regular communication with the teachers and other classroom personnel as part of the process.

2. Employment of teachers from suburban districts, during the summer program, in an effective program which generated excitement and a sense of challenge, while fostering a working familiarity with inner-city children from whom these teachers had typically been sheltered.

SASA Class C - In the Mount Pleasant project, in part defined by the modest funding in this suburban district under Title I criteria, the benefits of intensive staffing with a select group (twelve, less one who moved out of the district) of adolescents (ninth graders) was demonstrated. Staffing included a teacher, an aide, and the support of two administrators, a co-ordinator, a consultant, a psychologist, two guidance counsellors, and a secretary; all but the teacher and aide voluntary. The program emphasized reading and communication skills, but was equally concerned with improvement of the self-image of the children. To quote the report, "By using

small group techniques and appropriate curricular material, these students stated that they did not plan to return to school in September; however, they are now in school .... all but one of the participants was able to be promoted to the tenth grade." Field trips were considered, as in the case of many other projects in the state, as especially worth while parts of the total program, e.g., "The response to eating in a restaurant on two occasions when all-day trips were planned was so gratifying..."

In the New Castle project an effort was made to treat educationally and culturally deprived children by a counseling rather than an instructional program. The hope was that "A Child Guidance Center can be a method of discovering our shortcomings and improving instruction. It should result in the healthy development of individual children." While measures of the program's influence on academic areas were inadequate, the use of (1) in-service training for teachers of classes having low income educationally deprived children, (2) student group counseling, (3) family counseling, (4) parent-teacher-counselor conferences, and (5) individual counseling appears to have resulted in "positive changes in attitudes toward school, attitudes toward peers, and more positive behavior both at home and at school." The most remarkable progress in this area was found among the elementary level students involved in the program, but an equally significant effect of the program seems to have been the increased interest among the parents and their neighborhoods in their involvement with the schools and concurrent support of the school efforts to serve their children.

S&S Class D - the Lewes district project, "A Language Communication Skills Improvement Program" was exemplary (although not unique) in its conscious relation of the specific activity to its primary purpose. In the brief summer program, the 100 students each were participants in three or four field trips, all appropriate to the grades levels involved. Destinations included the local post office, dairies, sites on Delaware Bay, and local telephone and radio facilities. The programs were remarkable in that their specific objective was "increase in oral vocabulary", and to this end not only was conversation fostered during the course of the trips, but open classroom discussions held afterwards and group study of tape recorded trip reports apparently did much to stimulate expression.

S&S Class E - none to report.

89-313 - In the Emily P. Bissell Hospital project, involving 20 pre-school youngsters plus nine others of age for grades one through nine, a general educational and recreational program was introduced through the use of 89-10 Title I and 89-313 funds during the summer of 1966. Having a paid instructional staff and coordinated use of outside resource persons was an innovation for this institution, but the program was both generally innovative and exemplary in providing a flexible and imaginative program fostering both academic and personality development in an institution primarily concerned with physical care and treatment. A varied content of pre-school readiness work, including art, small class basic instruction, teacher-centered games, and visits by such as a "world traveler", 2 state policemen, and a fire truck, together with a vast amount of medical and administrative staff support for the program, produced, albeit a Hawthorne effect, a significantly improved esprit within the hospital generally.

Comments of the professional staff regarding the program included: "positive positive and lasting behavior", "fewer behavior problems on the floor", "outbreaks are less frequent and less severe", and "all children in education programs are now taking injections without protest". The general cause of the evaluation report, while not including use of any standardized measurement instruments, is that both the initial treatment of these children has been greatly facilitated by the program, and, concurrently, their readiness for enrollment in a regular educational program, at the hospital or in the public schools, has been vastly enhanced.

7. Materials Desired Most for Each Program:

In view of the methods follow-up, needs in regard to instructional staff for each program:

S.S. (Class A - none, i.e., no such districts.
S.S. (Class B - Unique - Recruitment for summer program from suburban districts.
Other - In-service workshops, staff meetings, subsidizing college courses.
S.S. Class C - In-service workshops, staff meetings, subsidizing college course enrollment.
S.S. Class D - In-service workshops, staff meetings, subsidizing college course enrollment.
M.R. Class E - Unreported.
CD-CIC - Staff meetings including professional staff and consultants.

8. Instruments:

Below is listed by level the most frequently used instruments in reading, plus a select few others. (Indents the same.)

(a) Pre-K/Special Education
(b) Grade K
(c) Grade 1/1-3
(d) Grade 2-3
(e) Grade 10-12

Note: For fiscal 1967, the following instruments will be in general use in the areas:

Grades K-2 - Metropolitan Reading Readiness Test (1965) Forms A and B
Grades K-3 - Durham School Readiness Inventory (1966) Forms A and B (in certain projects only)
Grade K-12- Slosson Intelligence Test (frequent in K and 1, only for CD-CIC and unique cases in higher grades)
Grades 1-12- Metropolitan Achievement Tests (1965) Forms A and B or Stanford Achievement Tests (1964) Forms W and X, levels as appropriate (typically only the vocabulary and comprehension subtests).
General - Other instruments only as uniquely appropriate to a program or as data incidentally obtainable as part of a school wide testing program.

(a) Kgn1 Pre-School - Doc Clark Reading Readiness (2)
(b) Grade K-3 - California Achievement Test, Lower Primary Level,

1957 edition, Form 1 (2)
Gates Primary Reading Test, 1958 edition, Forms 1, 2 and 3 (8)
Gates Advanced Primary Reading Test, 1958 edition, Forms 1, 2 and 3 (5)
Gates Reading Survey, 1958 edition, Forms 1 and 2 (3)
Iowa Tests of Basic Skills, Form 1 (3)
Lee Clark Reading Readiness Test, Primer Level (2)
Lee Clark Reading Test, First Reader Level (2)
Metropolitan Achievement Tests, 1959 edition, Primary I, Primary II and Elementary Levels, Forms A and B (6)
Science Research Associates Achievement Tests (Series), 1-2 and 2-4 Levels, Forms C and D (1)
Stanford Achievement Tests, 1964 edition, Primary I and Primary II Levels (5)
Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children (5)
Wide Range Achievement Test (4)

(c) Grades 4-6

Gates Advanced Primary Reading Test, 1958 edition, Forms 1, 2 and 3 (3)
Gates Reading Survey, 1958 edition, Forms 1 and 2 (7)
Gates McGinite Reading Tests, 1958 edition, Forms 1 and 2 (2)
Metropolitan Achievement Tests, 1959 edition, Elementary and Intermediate Levels (2)
Stanford Achievement Tests, 1964 edition, Primary II, Intermediate I and II Levels, Forms W, X and Y (3)
Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children (4)

(d) Grades 7-9

Gates Reading Survey, 1958 edition, Form 1 and 2 (5)
Metropolitan Achievement Tests, 1959 edition, Advanced Level (2)
Sequential Tests of Educational Progress, Levels 3 and 4, Form B(2)
Stanford Achievement Tests, 1964 edition, Advanced Level (3)

(e) Grades 10-12

Gates Reading Survey, 1958 edition, Forms 1 and 2 (5)

(Number in parenthesis indicates number of districts in which pre and post-testing were done.)

9. ANALYSIS OF PROJECT ACTIVITIES AND METHODS.

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

(1) Early years - (Preschool through grade 3)
(2) Middle years - (Grade 4 through grade 6)
(3) Teen years - (Grade 7 through grade 12)

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

(1) Exploratory trips
Individual activities
Readiness experiences
Health services
Small group instruction

(2) Corrective instruction
Provision of health services
Psychological services
Provision for clothing, glasses, etc. if needed
Home-school contacts

(3) Summer school opportunities
Work-study programs
Corrective instruction
Cultural experiences
Home-school contacts

The effectiveness of these activities in all cases was determined by the personnel involved. If teachers, social workers, psychologists, aides, etc. were able, enthusiastic and concerned the activities were successful.

The degree of success was in direct relation to the ability of the staff to relate to the pupils involved in the program.

The strengths and weaknesses of activities whether the activity involved equipment, materials, services, etc. seemed to be determined by the competency of the personnel hired to conduct the project.

10. THE IMPACT OF TITLE I

One of the most effective accomplishments of Title I programs in Delaware during FY'66 occurred in areas where all negro schools were planning to close into larger schools during the 1966-67 school year.

Title I programs gave children of both races opportunities to work, learn and play together before the regular school year. Chief School officers in Delaware believe that Title I programs in many areas developed positive attitudes on the part of both children and parents. It may have taken a much longer time to accomplish the same thing in larger groups during the school year.

PART III

FUTURE PLANS

ITEM 1 - For a selected sample of representative projects in skill development subjects and attitudinal and behavioral development, indicate the number of projects that employed each of the specified types of standardized tests and other measures.

ITEM 2 - For major types of projects (e.g. reading, arithmetic, preschool, health services, after school study centers, audio-visual, guidance services, etc.) prepared tables summarizing the numbers of projects which showed substantial increases in achieving their objectives, of limited success or no success in achieving their objectives.

ITEM 3 - Definitions

Average Daily Attendance (ADA) - The aggregate days attendance of a given school during a given reporting period divided by the number of days school is in session during this period. Only days on which the pupils are under the guidance and direction of teachers should be considered as days in session. The reporting period is generally a given regular school term. The average daily attendance for groups of [illegible] having varying lengths of terms is the sum of the average d[illegible] obtained for the individual schools.

Average Daily Membership (ADM) - The aggregate days membership of a given school during a given reporting period divided by the number of days school is in session during this period. Only days on which the pupils are under the guidance and direction of teachers should be considered as days in session. The reporting period is generally a given regular school term. The average daily membership for groups of schools having varying lengths of terms is the sum of the average daily memberships obtained for the individual schools. For purposes of obtaining statistical comparability only, pupil-staff ratios involving kindergarten and nursery pupils attending a half-day session are computed as though these pupils are in membership for a half day.

Table I

Evaluation Measurement Tools

Instrument Type	f of use in Skill Development Projects					f of use in Attitudinal and Behavioral Development Projects				
	Pre-K	1-3	4-6	7-9	10-12	Pre-K	1-3	4-6	7-9	10-12
I. STANDARDIZED TESTS										
a. Achievement	01	26	23	13	—	—	—	—	01	01
b. Intelligence			03							
c. Aptitude										
d. Interest										
e. Attitude										
f. Other-										
Readiness	01	02								
II. OTHER TESTS										
a. Locally Devised	1	03	02							
b. Teacher Made		03	04	01						
c. Other										
III. OTHER MEASURES										
a. Teacher Rating		09	05	06			02	02	01	
b. Anecdotal Rcds.	1	05	03	02						
c. Observer Rtgs.		05	05	03			01	01		
d. Other -										
Count of Books Read		06	05	03						
Sociograms		01	01	01						
Attendance		04	04	02						
Writing samples		01	01							
Health exam		01	01							
Case studies		03	03	03						
Pupil Appraisals		02	03	03						
Parent Appraisals		02	03	02			01	01		

Notes:

Tests tabulated are limited to pre and post testing for evaluation purposes; screening instruments are not included. The same standard of pre and post measurement holds true for attendance, writing samples, and health exams.

Unique LEA's involved total as follows:

31 involved in Skill Development Programs used pre and post tools and other measures tabulated above.

2 involved in Attitudinal and Behavioral Development Programs, including one also involved in a Skill Development Programs, tabulated above.

4 involved in Skill Development Programs neglected to report any struetured evaluation measurements.

TABLE 2

SUMMARY OF EFFECTIVENESS FOR TYPES OF PROJECTS

LEVEL	PROJECT TYPE (By stated primary and secondary objectives)	EFFECTIVENESS Sub	Mod	Neg
K	PRE SCHOOL READINESS	1	1	
	Improve motivation and curiosity		1	1
	Cultural enrichment		1	
	Improvement of home-school relationships			1
	Providing need supportive services (nursing, therapy)		1	
1-3	IMPROVEMENT OF READING AND COMMUNICATION SKILLS	2	13	13
	Improvement of quantitative skills			1
	Fostering independent reading	1	2	2
	Improvement of academic skills generally		2	3
	Improvement of motivation and initiative	3	5	1
	Improvement of attitude toward education and school	6	3	2
	Improvement of social attitudes and behavior		3	1
	Improvement of individual self-concept		3	
	Improvement of home-school relationships		2	2
	Fostering cultural enrichment and broadened interests		5	1
	Providing need supportive services (nursing, therapy)		2	1
	Improvement of health and health habits		3	
1-3	IMPROVEMENT OF ACADEMIC SKILLS GENERALLY			1
	Fostering cultural enrichment and broadened interests			1
1-3	IMPROVEMENT OF SOCIAL ATTITUDES AND BEHAVIOR, ESPECIALLY REDUCING NEGATIVE BEHAVIOR		1	
4-6	IMPROVEMENT OF READING AND COMMUNICATION SKILLS	4	18	7
	Improvement of quantitative skills		1	1
	Fostering independent reading	2	3	3
	Improvement of academic skills generally	4		1
	Improvement of motivation and initiative	3	1	1
	Improvement of attitude toward education and school	4	2	2
	Improvement of social attitudes and behavior	2	4	1
	Improvement of individual self-concept		6	
	Improvement of home-school relationships		2	2
	Fostering cultural enrichment and broadened interests	1	10	
	Providing needed supportive services (nursing, therapy)		3	1
	Improvement of health and health habits		2	
4-6	IMPROVEMENT OF ACADEMIC SKILLS GENERALLY			1
	Fostering cultural enrichment and broadened interests			1
4-6	IMPROVEMENT OF SOCIAL ATTITUDES AND BEHAVIOR, ESPECIALLY REDUCING NEGATIVE BEHAVIOR		1	

TABLE 2, Con't.

7-9	IMPROVEMENT OF READING AND COMMUNICATION SKILLS	2	9	5
	Fostering independent reading	1	1	2
	Improvement of academic skills generally		1	1
	Improvement of motivation and initiative	2	3	1
	Discouragement of dropping out		1	1
	Improvement of attitude toward education and school		3	2
	Improvement of social attitudes and behavior	3	1	
	Improvement of individual self-concept		5	
	Improvement of home-school relationships	1	2	
	Fostering cultural enrichment and broadened interests	1	4	
	Providing needed supportive services (nursing, therapy)		1	1
	Improvement of health and health habits		2	
7-9	IMPROVEMENT OF ACADEMIC SKILLS GENERALLY			1
	Fostering cultural enrichment and broadened interests		1	
7-9	IMPROVEMENT OF SOCIAL ATTITUDES AND BEHAVIOR, ESPECIALLY REDUCING NEGATIVE BEHAVIOR			1
10-12	IMPROVEMENT OF READING AND COMMUNICATION SKILLS		6	3
	Fostering independent reading		1	
	Improvement of academic skills generally		1	
	Discouragement of dropping out	1		1
	Improvement of attitude toward education and school	3	1	1
	Improvement of social attitudes and behavior	2	2	
	Improvement of individual self-concept		2	
	Improvement of home-school relationships			1
	Fostering cultural enrichment and broadened interests	1		
	Providing needed supportive services		2	1
	Improvement of health and health habits			1
10-12	IMPROVEMENT OF SOCIAL ATTITUDES AND BEHAVIOR, ESPECIALLY REDUCING NEGATIVE BEHAVIOR			1

TABLE 3

AVERAGE DAILY ATTENDANCE AND AVERAGE DAILY MEMBERSHIP RATES
FOR TITLE I PROJECT SCHOOLS COMPARED TO STATE NORM 1/

Name of School	1964-1965 ADM(Grs.1-12)	1964-1965 ADA(Grs.1-12)	1965-1966 ADM(Grs.1-12)	1965-1966 ADA(Grs.1-12)
Bridgeville	1025	1085	1,100	1047
Claymont	2773	2656	2818	2665
Clayton, J.M.	601	571	651	617
Frankford	274	260	254	243
DeLaWarr	4381	4071	4366	4069
Dover	4149	3938	4434	4179
Felton-Frederica) Felton	819	781	1042	983
Frederica	278	263	319	303
Georgetown	1520	1448	1529	1455
Greenwood	640	616	685	658
Gunning-Bedford	931	860	1017	938
Harrington	1181	1119	1248	1174
Wm. Henry	741	637	361	310
Wm. C. Jason	1178	1054	862	767
Laurel	2010	1910	1972	1865
Lewes	1252	1197	1440	1316
Lincoln	126	120	216	201
Marshallton-Dickinson) Marsh.	2721	2590	2813	2667
Dickin.	1379	1314	1417	1344

TABLE 3 (Con't)

Name of School	1964-1965 ADM(Grs.1-12)	1964-1965 ADA(Grs.1-12)	1965-1966 ADM(Grs.1-12)	1965-1966 ADA(Grs.1-12)
Middletown-Townsend-#60	1149	1079	1607	1518
#120	645	595	550	342
Townsend	381	356		
Milford-Ellendale-Milford	2790	2658	2805	2654
Ellendale	155	149	242	228
Millsboro #23	825	785	940	895
Millsboro #204	348	336	360	340
Milton	694	662	905	860
Mt. Pleasant	5002	4780	5046	4860
Newark	9847	9246	10534	10024
New Castle	5447	5120	5719	5399
Newport	1610	1531	1658	1576
Rehoboth	447	427	587	555
Richardson Park	940	886	980	916
Caesar Rodney	5132	4891	5366	5115
Seaford	3077	2943	3304	3140
Selbyville-32	476	452	612	583
-210			194	185
Smyrna	2249	2101	2362	2213
Stanton	3338	3186	3683	3531
Wilmington	14088	13123	14 485	13303

Addenda To Table 3

AVERAGE DAILY MEMBERSHIP AND AVERAGE DAILY ATTENDANCE OF PUPILS
1965-1966

Name of School	Average Daily Membership 1-6	7-12	1-12	Average Daily Attendance 1-6	7-12	1-12
NEW CASTLE COUNTY						
Arden 3	83	-	83	76	-	76
Bedford, Gunning 53	544	473	1,017	509	429	938
Claymont	1,615	1,203	2,818	1,540	1,125	2,665
Conrad, Henry C. 131	-	1,210	1,210	-	1,117	1,117
DeLaWarr 47	2,466	1,900	4,366	2,311	1,758	4,069
Dickinson, John 133	-	1,417	1,417	-	1,344	1,344
DuPont, Alexis I.	1,081	990	2,071	1,033	950	1,983
DuPont, Alfred I. 7	4,292	3,497	7,789	4,103	3,350	7,453
Marshallton 77	1,945	868	2,813	1,842	825	2,667
Middletown 60	878	729	1,607	830	688	1,518
Middletown 120	283	267	550	180	162	342
Mount Pleasant	2,561	2,485	5,046	2,443	2,417	4,860
New Castle	3,279	2,440	5,719	3,106	2,293	5,399
Newark	6,227	4,307	10,534	5,945	4,079	10,024
Newport 21	1,128	530	1,658	1,073	503	1,576
Oak Grove 130	1,320	532	1,852	1,257	505	1,762
Odessa 61	146	-	146	136	-	136
Richardson Park 20	650	330	980	608	308	916
Stanton 38	2,703	980	3,683	2,585	946	3,531
Wilmington	7,967	6,518	14,485	7,365	5,938	13,303
Total New Castle County	39,168	30,676	69,844	36,942	28,737	65,679

Table continued on following page

AVERAGE DAILY MEMBERSHIP AND AVERAGE DAILY ATTENDANCE OF PUPILS
1965-1966

Name of School	Average Daily Membership			Average Daily Attendance		
	1-6	7-12	1-12	1-6	7-12	1-12
KENT COUNTY						
Dover	2,672	1,762	4,434	2,513	1,666	4,179
Felton 54	600	442	1,042	567	416	983
Frederica 32	319	-	319	303	-	303
Harrington	709	539	1,248	669	505	1,174
Hartly 96	285	54	339	273	51	324
Henry, Wm. W. M. 133	-	361	361	-	310	310
Houston 125	92	-	92	88	-	88
Kenton 9	116	-	116	109	-	109
Magnolia 50	219	-	219	208	-	208
Milford	1,399	1,406	2,805	1,325	1,329	2,654
Oak Point 20	31	-	31	28	-	28
Rodney, Caesar	3,603	1,763	5,366	3,438	1,677	5,115
Rose Valley 79	51	-	51	48	-	48
Smyrna	1,326	1,036	2,362	1,236	977	2,213
Wiley's 93	17	-	17	16	-	16
Total Kent County	11,439	7,363	18,802	10,821	6,931	17,752
SUSSEX COUNTY						
Bridgeville 90	662	438	1,100	630	417	1,047
Clayton, John M. 97	346	305	651	328	289	617
Delmar 163	-	553	553	-	520	520
Ellendale 125	242	-	242	228	-	228
Frankford 206	254	-	254	243	-	243
Georgetown	879	650	1,529	834	621	1,455
Greenwood 91	392	293	685	377	281	658
Jason, William C. 192	12	850	862	10	757	767
Laurel	1,102	870	1,972	1,040	825	1,865
Lewes	825	615	1,440	784	532	1,316
Lincoln 3	216	-	216	201	-	201
Lord Baltimore 28	240	248	488	202	233	435
Millsboro 23	530	410	940	506	389	895
Millsboro 204	301	59	360	284	56	340
Milton 8	580	325	905	551	309	860
Rehoboth	329	258	587	312	243	555
Seaford	1,802	1,502	3,304	1,708	1,432	3,140
Selbyville 32	282	330	612	268	315	583
Selbyville 210	194	-	194	185	-	185
Total Sussex County	9,188	7,706	16,894	8,691	7,219	15,910
TOTAL STATE	59,795	45,745	105,540	56,454	42,887	99,341

Research and Publications

TABLE IV

AVERAGE DAILY MEMBERSHIP AND AVERAGE DAILY ATTENDANCE OF PUPILS

1964-1965

Name of School	Average Daily Membership 1-6	7-12	1-12	Average Daily Attendance 1-6	7-12	1-12
NEW CASTLE COUNTY						
Arden 3	79	—	79	75	—	75
Bedford, Gunning, Jr. 53	516	415	931	480	380	860
Claymont Special	1,546	1,227	2,773	1,494	1,162	2,656
Conrad, Henry 131	—	1,163	1,163	—	1,087	1,087
DeLaWarr 47	2,505	1,876	4,381	2,351	1,720	4,071
Dickinson, John 133	—	1,379	1,379	—	1,314	1,314
DuPont, Alexis I. Special	1,034	909	1,943	984	872	1,856
DuPont, Alfred I. 7	3,851	3,081	6,932	3,687	2,965	6,652
Iron Hill 122	19	—	19	19	—	19
Marshallton 77	1,914	807	2,721	1,819	771	2,590
Middletown 60	527	622	1,149	514	583	1,097
Middletown 120	378	267	645	355	240	595
Mount Pleasant Special	2,589	2,413	5,002	2,472	2,308	4,780
New Castle Special	3,163	2,284	5,447	2,976	2,144	5,120
Newark Special	5,596	4,251	9,847	5,327	3,919	9,246
Newport 21	1,104	506	1,610	1,047	484	1,531
Oak Grove 130	1,249	543	1,792	1,189	507	1,696
Odessa 61	132	—	132	124	—	124
Richardson Park 20	617	323	940	580	306	886
Stanton 38	2,460	878	3,338	2,345	841	3,186
Townsend 81	303	78	381	284	72	356
Wilmington	7,715	6,373	14,088	7,221	5,902	13,123
Total New Castle County	37,297	29,395	66,692	35,343	27,577	62,920
KENT COUNTY						
Dover Special	2,632	1,517	4,149	2,492	1,446	3,938
Felton 54	441	378	819	422	359	781
Fork Branch	19	—	19	19	—	19
Frederica 32	278	—	278	263	—	263
Harrington Special	694	487	1,181	661	458	1,119
Hartly 96	261	47	308	247	45	292
Henry, W. M. Comp. 133	—	741	741	—	637	637
Houston 125	92	—	92	88	—	88
Kenton 9	91	—	91	84	—	84
Kenton 140	63	—	63	59	—	59
Little Creek 85	19	—	19	18	—	18
Magnolia 50	166	—	166	160	—	160
Milford Special	1,470	1,320	2,790	1,395	1,263	2,658
Mount Olive 155	49	—	49	48	—	48
Oak Point 20	29	—	29	26	—	26
Rodney, Caesar Special	3,507	1,625	5,132	3,342	1,549	4,891
Rose Valley 79	45	—	45	42	—	42
Smyrna Special	1,289	960	2,249	1,203	898	2,101
Union 158 (Estimated)	38	—	38	36	—	36

Table Continued on Following Page

Research and Publications

TABLE IV—Continued

AVERAGE DAILY MEMBERSHIP AND AVERAGE DAILY ATTENDANCE OF PUPILS

1964-1965

Name of School	Average Daily Membership 1-6	7-12	1-12	Average Daily Attendance 1-6	7-12	1-12
Viola 156	72	—	72	67	—	67
Wiley's 93	14	—	14	13	—	13
Total Kent County	11,269	7,075	18,344	10,685	6,655	17,340
SUSSEX COUNTY						
Blades 172	95	—	95	92	—	92
Bridgeville 90	354	330	684	338	320	658
Bridgeville 220	281	60	341	269	58	327
Clayton, John M. 97	322	279	601	306	265	571
Concord 216	53	—	53	52	—	52
Delmar 163	60	490	550	57	466	523
Delmar 212½	21	—	21	20	—	20
Drawbridge 197	44	—	44	42	—	42
Ellendale 125	155	—	155	149	—	149
Ellendale 195	98	—	98	95	—	95
Frankford 206	274	—	274	260	—	260
Georgetown Special	867	653	1,520	826	622	1,448
Greenwood 91	360	280	640	345	271	616
Greenwood 222	18	—	18	17	—	17
Gumboro 37	72	23	95	69	22	91
Joson, Wm. C. Comp. 192	—	1,178	1,178	—	1,054	1,054
Laurel Special	1,118	892	2,010	1,066	844	1,910
Lewes Special	705	547	1,252	672	525	1,197
Lincoln 3	126	—	126	120	—	120
Lincoln 194 (Estimated)	28	—	28	27	—	27
Lord Baltimore 28	205	226	431	193	216	409
Millsboro 23	439	386	825	417	368	785
Millsboro 204	289	59	348	279	57	336
Milton 8	365	329	694	346	316	662
Milton 196	133	—	133	127	—	127
Nassau 198	54	—	54	53	—	53
Owens Corner 213	51	—	51	49	—	49
Rabbit's Ferry 201	31	—	31	30	—	30
Rehoboth Special	227	220	447	218	209	427
Rehoboth 200	92	—	92	89	—	89
Roxana 31	48	—	48	47	—	47
Seaford Special	1,639	1,438	3,077	1,560	1,383	2,943
Selbyville 32	217	259	476	206	246	452
Selbyville 210	244	—	244	231	—	231
Slaughter Neck 193	110	—	110	102	—	102
Total Sussex County	9,195	7,649	16,844	8,769	7,242	16,011
TAL STATE	57,761	44,119	101,880	54,797	41,474	96,271

TABLE 4

WORKSHEET FOR DETERMINING DROPOUT RATE

STATE _____ GRADE ____

Month	Membership at Beginning of Month	Transfers In	Transfers Out	Graduates	Death	Dropouts	Membership at End of Month
JULY							
AUGUST							
SEPTEMBER							
OCTOBER							
NOVEMBER							
DECEMBER							
JANUARY							
FEBRUARY							
MARCH							
APRIL							
MAY							
JUNE							1/
TOTALS				3/		2/	

CALCULATIONS:

Arithmetic Accountability

End of Year Membership	1/	_____
Number of Dropouts	2/	_____
Number of Graduates	3/	_____
TOTAL		_____

Annual Dropout Rate = Number of Dropouts / Arithmetic Accountability

= _____

TOTAL = _____ %

TABLE 5 - Notes

The dropout rate should be computed as follows:

Annual Dropout Rate - Number of Dropouts July 1 to June 30 1/
Arithmetic Accountability July 1 to June 30 2/
Arithmetic Accountability - End of Year Membership (June 30) 4/
All Graduates + Dropouts (July 1 to June 30)

1/
Dropout - A pupil who leaves a school, for any reason except death, before graduation or completion of a program of studies and without transferring to another school. (Schools must keep a complete accountability of a student throughout the year in order to differentiate between dropouts and transfers.) The term "dropout" is used most often to designate an elementary or secondary school pupil who has been in membership during the regular school term and who withdraws from membership before graduating from secondary school (grade 12) or before completing an equivalent program of studies. Such an individual is considered a dropout whether his dropping out occurs during or between regular school terms, whether his dropping out occurs before or after he has passed the compulsory school attendance age, and, where applicable, whether or not he has completed a minimum required amount of school work.
(Definition from: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Pupil Accounting for Local and State School Systems, State Educational Records and Reports Series: Handbook V, pp. 96-97.)

2/
Arithmetic Accountability is determined by adding the following three items:

(a) End-of-the-year membership -- The number of pupils on the current roll of a class or school as of June 30th of the year studied. (For example, if we were to study the 1965-1965 dropout rate, the end of year membership would be on June 30, 1965). Make some exception for promotion dropout for the summer. Pupils graduating during this period of time are not included in the end-of-year membership.

(b) Graduate - An individual who has received formal recognition for the successful completion of a prescribed program of studies.

(c) Dropout - See above definition.

3/
Special Note: The end of year membership includes all members of the grade on the last day of school which may precede June 30th. Those students who drop out between the last day of school and the following school year should be considered as a dropout for the new year.

TABLE 5

BASE DATE FOR

DROPOUT RATES (HOLDING POWER)

TITLE I PROJECT SCHOOLS COMPARED WITH NON-TITLE I SCHOOLS

Note: The following data represents only the one SMSA Class B District in the State of Delaware. Data on other districts, whether now engaged in ESEA Title I projects or not, either has never been compiled or cannot be derived from enrollment and graduation figures available.

Data for the one district will shortly be available for school year 65-66, and should be permanently updated. Every attempt is being made to obtain future dropout data from schools currently involved in Title I programs, but it is felt that the data base will in these cases be the 1966-67 school year.

Grade	Dropouts/ September Enrollment 1963-1964 Title I	1963-1964 Non-Title I	1964-1965 Title I	1964-1965 Non Title I
12	15/829 (1.8%)		39/925 (4.2%)	
11	68/1033 (6.5%)		72/1061 (6.7%)	
10	83/1215 (6.8%)		99/1183 (8.3%)	
9	31/1054 (2.9%)		50/1120 (4.4%)	
8	10/987 (1.0%)		14/996 (1.4%)	
7	1/1036 (0.0%)		0/1067 (0.0%)	
Ungr. or Unknown (H.S.age)	13/297 (% n/a)		24/279 (% n/a)	
N Schools (Districts)	1		1	
N Students	6,451		6,631	
N Dropouts	221 (3.4%)		298 (4.4%)	

TABLE 6

PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS IN TITLE I PROJECT HIGH SCHOOLS

CONTINUING EDUCATION BEYOND HIGH SCHOOL COMPARED WITH STATE NORM

	1963-1964		1964-1965	
	Title I Sch.	State Norm	Title I Sch.	State Norm
N of Graduates	4159	4964	4978	5993
N of Schools	34	39	34	39
x Graduating Class	122	127	146	154
N of Schools with 00-10% of Grads Continuing	1	1	1	1
N w/ 11-20%	0	0	1	1
N w/21-30%	5	5	7	7
N w/ 31-40%	8	9	6	7
N w/ 41-50%	12	15	12	14
N w/ 51-60%	4	4	5	5
N w/ 61% or more	4	6	2	4
x % Continuing	46%	49%	45%	48%

Notes: "State Norm" - Total for all high schools in the state.
"Title I Schools" - All high schools in Districts which had Title I projects during 1965-1966.
Data derived from Wilmington and state published follow-up studies; "N of graduates" for Title I schools interpolated at ratio of actual graduates in state (less Wilmington) to graduates followed up.
Percentages are possibly inflated as much as 3 percent due to being calculated on number of students followed up rather than N of grads.

MOST WIDELY USED TESTS IN SKILL SUBJECTS FOR ESEA, TITLE I BENEFICIARIES

COMPREHENSION

TABLE 7

GRADES	TESTING PERIOD (YEARS)	TEST & FORM	SUB-TEST	N. SCHOOLS	N. STUDENTS	PRE-TEST MEAN RAW SCORE	POST-TEST MEAN RAW SCORE
1-2	0.24	Cal.LO.Primary, W	Comprehension	1	105	6.1	7.7
1-6	0.10	Gates Primary Reading Forms 1 & 2	Sentences	4	156	25.6	27.3
1-6	0.12		Paragraphs	7	129	14.2	15.7
1	0.25	Gates Reading Primary I, Forml	Comprehension	1	24	6.1	10.7
4-6	0.09	Gates Basic Reading	Comprehension	1	25	13.4	16.1
3-4	0.10	Gates Advanced Primary,Forms 1&2	Paragraphs	2	24	17.5	17.4
2-12	0.25	Gates Reading Survey,Forms 1 & 2	Comprehension	9	928	13.2	14.6
1-6	0.12	Gates-MacGinitie Reading,Forms C & D	Comprehension	1	78	18.1	21.9
3-6	0.11	Iowa Test Basic Skills, Form 1	Reading	2	120	19.9	19.7
2	0.25	Metrop.Ach.Test Primary II,Form B	Reading	1	36	16.2	19.1
3-6	0.27	Metrop.Ach.Test Elementary,Form B	Reading	2	128	11.7	14.3
7-9	0.14	Metrop.Ach.Test Advanced,Form A	Reading	1	11	17.0	18.0
4-10	0.28	Sequential Tests of Educational Progress, Form B	Reading	2	171	245 C	248 C
1-2	0.18	Stanford Ach., Primary I,Forms W X Y	Paragraph Meaning	3	65	15.0	18.0
2-4	0.17	Stanford Ach., Primary II,Forms W X Y	Paragraph Meaning	2	53	24.5	22.7

MOST WIDELY USED TESTS IN SKILL SUBJECTS FOR ESEA, TITLE I BENEFICIARIES

COMPREHENSION

TABLE 7 (Con't)

GRADES	TESTING PERIOD (YEARS)	TEST & FORM	SUB-TEST	N. SCHOOLS	N. STUDENTS	PRE-TEST MEAN RAW SCORE	POST-TEST MEAN RAW SCORE
4-6	0.18	Stanford Ach. Interim I Forms W X Y	Paragraph Mean.	3	59	22.4	22.7
5-6	0.25	Stanford Ach. Interim II Forms W X	Paragraph Mean.	2	28	21.6	21.6
7-8	0.25	Stanford Ach. Adv. Form W	Paragraph Mean.	1	17	23.1	30.6
1-6	0.28	Wide Range Ach.	Reading	3	94	31.5	34.5

TABULAR DATA - 8

(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.

Examples of these approaches would be:
provision of teacher aides,
provision of additional teacher time,
provision of equipment and supplies,
introduction of in-service training, etc.

TABULAR DATE - SECTION 8

(a) MOST COMMONLY FUNDED TITLE I PROJECTS, GROUPED BY PRIMARY OBJECTIVE

Improvement of Reading and Communication Skills (N of projects - 29)

Improvement of Social Attitudes and Behavior (N of projects - 3)

Pre-School Readiness (N of projects - 2, both concurrently reading programs)

Improvement of Academic Skills Generally (N of projects - 1)

(b) MOST COMMON APPROACHES USED TO REACH PRIMARY OBJECTIVES, BY PROGRAM TYPE

Programs aimed at improvement of reading and communication skills (N-29)

Small classes	10
Ungraded classes	4
Individualized instruction	6
Team teaching	1
Teacher aides	16
Diagnostic tests	6
Physical exams and treatment	8
Breakfast supplement	1
Recreation	3
Furnishing of clothing	1
Home visits and family instruction	6
Field trips	8
Self selection of library readings	4
Arts, music and crafts instruction	1
Intensive supplying	3
Taping and playing back of student reading	5
Phonic workbooks	3
Creative writing exercises	2
SRA Reading Lab use	3
Language Experience Approach	10

Note: 1. Conventional or traditional instructional methods not reported.
2. Approaches not specified in LEA reports would undoubtedly augment figures given above.

Programs aimed at improvement of social attitudes and behavior (N-3)

Group counseling	1
Family instruction	1
Diagnostic tests	1
Physical exams and treatment	1

TABULAR DATA - 8 Con't.

Improvement of academic skills generally, Programs aimed at (N-1)

Small classes	1
Diagnostic tests	1
Team teaching	1
Intensive supplying	1
Taping and playing back of student reading	1
Projection and discussion of compositions	1

Addendum 1

Most common approaches used in 89-313 projects

Programs aimed at improvement of reading and communication skills, but principally on a readiness basis (N reporting - 2)

Ungraded classes	1
Recreation	2
Field trips	1
Arts, music and crafts instruction	1
Self selection of library readings	1
Taping and playing back of student reading	1

Addendum 2

Use of teacher aides

Project	N Students	N Aides
Bridgeville	83	1
DeLaWarr	120	6
Dover*	525	20
Felton	105	5
Georgetown	184	21
Gunning Bedford	54	2
John M. Clayton	97	6
Laurel	240	32
Lewes	109	5
Middletown	136	11
Milford	274	31
Mount Pleasant	11	1
Newark	47	1
Richardson Park	128	8
Solbyville	96	2
Seaford **	167	3
Smyrna	178	12
Wilmington	4830	83

* General academic skills improvement project
** Guidance project
Mean ratio, students to aides - 31:1
N of districts using teacher aides - 18 of 29 reporting

001 UD004440160868
100Delaware annual evaluation report, ESEA Title I-FY '66.
200
300 EYV20775
310
030NOV66
500EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$1.96 47p.
600*PROGRAM EVALUATION, *DISADVANTAGED YOUTH, *FEDERAL PROGRAMS,
601*COMPENSATORY EDUCATION PROGRAMS, MEASUREMENT INSTRUMENTS, STAFF
602UTILIZATION, ATTENDANCE, HIGHER EDUCATION, STATISTICAL DATA, PROGRAM
603COSTS, PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION, TEST RESULTS, SCHOOL SERVICES,
604DROPOUT RATE, READING TESTS, STUDENT IMPROVEMENT, ACHIEVEMENT TESTS,
605METROPOLITAN ACHIEVEMENT TESTS, STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT TESTS,
606DELAWARE, SEQUENTIAL TESTS OF EDUCATIONAL PROGRESS, CALIFORNIA
607LOWER PRIMARY BATTERY, ESEA TITLE 1
800THIS REPORT IS AN EVALUATION OF THE COMPENSATORY EDUCATION
801ACTIVITIES IN DELAWARE FUNDED UNDER TITLE I OF THE ELEMENTARY AND
802SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT. THE MATERIAL IS ARRANGED ACCORDING TO THE
803FORMAT STIPULATED BY THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. IN SECTION I
804THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASPECTS OF THE PROGRAM ARE DESCRIBED AND THE
805PUPILS' PERFORMANCE ON A NUMBER OF STANDARDIZED ACHIEVEMENT TESTS
806IS REPORTED. SECTION II CONTAINS DATA ON PROGRAM ACTIVITIES AND
807METHODS, PUPIL ENROLLMENT, AND PROGRAM COSTS. SECTION III IS MADE
808UP OF TABULAR DATA ON TEST RESULTS, ATTENDANCE, PROGRAM
809EFFECTIVENESS, DROPOUT RATE, STUDENTS CONTINUING THEIR EDUCATION
810BEYOND HIGH SCHOOL, AND COMMONLY FUNDED PROJECTS AND APPROACHES.
811(LB)