DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 034 828 UD 009 333

TITLE	Annual State Summary Report of Title I ESEA Projects, Fiscal Year 1967.
INSTITUTION	Maryland State Dept. of Education, Baltimore.
PUB DATE	[67]
NOTE	51p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$2.65
DESCRIPTORS	Cultural Enrichment, *Disadvantaged Youth, Handicapped Children, Language Arts, *Medical Services, Nutrition, Reading Improvement, *Reading Instruction, *Self Concept, Staff Utilization, Standardized Tests, Teaching Procedures, Test Results, Verbal Communication
IDENTIFIERS	*Elementary Secondary Education Title I Program, ESEA Title I Programs, Maryland

ABSTRACT

This 1967 Annual State Summary Report of Elementary and Secondary Education Act Title I Projects describes Maryland's objectives for educating disadvantaged children. Projects were aimed at improving reading and language arts skills, test performance, verbal and nonverbal communication and strengthening the student's concept of himself and his ability to learn. Medical and nutritional services were also part of the programs. Methods of instruction used, along with descriptions of staff development and utilization, and programs for handicapped children are included. Tabular and standardized achievement test data are appended. (KG)

Maryland - Annual

ANNUAL STATE SUMMARY REPORT OF TITLE I ESEA PROJECTS

Fiscal Year 1967

JAMES A. SENSENBAUGH
STATE SUPERINTENDENT

MARYLAND STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
STATE OFFICE BUILDING
301 WEST PRESTON STREET, BALTIMORE 21201

ANNUAL STATE SUMMARY REPORT OF TITLE I ESEA PROJECTS
Fiscal Year 1967

1. MAJOR ACHIEVEMENTS

The major achievements under Title I which have had statewide significance in educating disadvantaged children are

A. The preschool programs conducted under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act have been so successful they have convinced the public that early educational experience is very valuable. For many years school systems, parents, and the public had attempted to have statewide kindergarten. The 1967 Maryland General Assembly enacted a bill which now makes kindergartens a part of the public school system of Maryland.

B. Most school systems admit and accept as a problem the "education of disadvantaged youth." Prior to Title I, many school systems refused to admit this as a problem. School systems now are conscious of the need for changing some of their procedures and ways in educating one major portion of their children.

C. Aides have been found so successful in relieving teachers of many routine activities, and they have been useful in doing much of the follow-up activity which is required for mastery and understanding. Some school systems are now providing local funds for employment of aides. These aides are used in Title I as well as non-Title I schools.

D. Programs of education during the summers have become an accepted part of the total school experience. Teachers, pupils, parents, and the general public are anxious to have the educational opportunities which are provided during what was previously considered a vacation period.

E. More attention is being given to diagnosis of needs and the establishment of priorities within the school system, as well as with small groups and individual students.

F. "Parent involvement" has become a slogan which is simply being tried. It is replacing the traditional P.T.A. activities.

G. Several projects were successful in raising reading scores on standardized tests above the usual expectation for disadvantaged children.

2. DESCRIPTION OF ACTIVITIES AND METHODS

A. SEA Services to LEAs.

1. SEA staff consulted with local school systems concerning identification of needs and other blocks which may be preventing learning. These included an array of special services, such as health, nutrition, clothing, community and welfare needs, as well as the usual education deficiencies. The SEA staff discussed with the LEAs the feasibility of establishing priorities and assisted in the discussions where decisions were made concerning the inclusion or omission of emphasis or focus of the federal effort. This was accomplished during visits to the LEAs and, in some instances, representatives from the LEAs visited the State Department of Education.

2. The SEA serves in a consultive capacity in each of these areas and perhaps provides its greatest service in implementing the project when a school system finds difficulty in securing the personnel needed to staff the project. The consultation which accompanies the development and writing of the project also includes discussion on alternatives for implementing the project and cannot be clearly differentiated from many aspects of development.

3. The SEA provided consultative assistance in preparing the evaluation section in Title I applications. Specific services consisted of visits to some LEAs to advise concerning the mechanics of pre- and post-testings and processing of the scores for statistical computations. The SEA developed and distributed evaluation forms to the LEAs. Actual computations of means and standard deviations were provided for a few LEAs to facilitate their project evaluations. The Sea distributed to each LEA a brief review of the U.S. Office of Education's (October 1966) Guide to Evaluation of Title I Projects, along with the guide itself. The review referenced selected pages in the guide which described techniques of evaluation deemed appropriate for typical projects.

4. Several methods were used for dissemination of information:

   a. The Federal-State Program Memo, which is published and distributed at intervals, describes some of the more important aspects which are carried on across the State.

   b. The Title I supervisors visit each of the local school systems as many as eight or nine times during a school year. During these visits, discussions are held concerning the focus, emphasis, and procedures which are conducted in the various LEAs.

   c. A statewide conference was held where at least five representatives from each of the LEAs participated in discussions, and they brought with them material for distribution concerning their projects.

   d. Tapes, photographs, slides, and other materials have been exchanged among the local school systems so that they understand what is going on in the several different agencies.

   e. The SEA has published a brochure entitled "One to Get Ready." This brochure describes aspects of 13 of the most unique and innovative approaches for meeting some of the most pressing educational needs of deprived youth in the State. Copies of this brochure have gone to Title I central office staff, other educators and administrators in the central offices, and to each public and nonpublic school in the State. Additional copies have been sent to Maryland representatives in Congress, members of the General Assembly, institutions of higher learning, other public and nonpublic agencies, and influential organizations, such as the American Association of University Women, League of Women Voters, and community action agencies within the State.

B. Most Pressing Educational Needs

Rank 1 Deficiencies in Reading Ability and Language Arts Skills

Local Educational Agencies' (LEAs) project evaluation reports indicated that approximately 70 percent of the pupils in target areas were six months to one year below their grade placement in reading ability. The target area pupils were

generally below the 25th percentile in relation to the national norm for reading ability. These data were obtained from surveys and standardized test scores.

Rank 2 Low Performance in the Classroom and on Standardized Tests in Basic Content Areas

Classroom performance for project pupils ranged from one to two years below grade level in basic subject areas. At least 50 percent of the pupils in all LEAs scored in the lowest quartile on standardized tests in basic content areas.

Rank 3 Deficiencies in Verbal and Nonverbal Functioning

Standardized test results and teacher observations indicated that approximately 50 percent of the project pupils functioned poorly in the areas of verbal and nonverbal communications. Specifically, the need existed for the pupils to increase the amount and quality of oral communication and speech articulation.

Rank 4 Lack of Positive Concepts in Students Concerning Their Self-Images as a Significant Individual and Learner

Project data obtained from self-concept devices and teacher and staff opinions indicated that 50 percent of the pupils held negative concepts toward themselves, the school, and their abilities to learn.

Rank 5 Deficiencies in Nutritional and Medical Requirements

Physical examinations by school staff personnel and Title I nurses revealed that nutritional and medical deficiencies were prevalent in 33 percent of the target area pupils. The need for dental services was especially frequent.

C. Most Prevalent Project Objectives

Rank 1 To improve the reading skill of pupils (42% of projects)

Rank 2 To raise the levels of academic achievement (25% of projects)

Rank 3 To improve verbal and nonverval communication (20% of projects)

Rank 4 To develop a positive self-image and improve attitudes toward school and education (9% of projects)

Rank 5 To improve the health (nutritional-medical), welfare, and social needs of pupils (4% of projects)

The approaches in the instructional and service areas effective in accomplishing the objectives are listed below according to ranks. The ranks were determined by the frequency of their listings as effective approaches in the projects evaluations.

The approaches which refer to the objective ranked No. 1 are as follows:

Instructional

Rank 1 Reading Instruction - a variety of methods were utilized to teach reading, such as basal reader, individualized reading, and the language experience approach, along with the supplementary materials, such as audiovisual aids, films, and tape recorders. Emphasis was placed on spending more time on the individual child's skills, such as comprehension, word recognition, and vocabulary skills, for which 50 percent to 60 percent of the class time was devoted.

Rank 2 Teacher Aides and Other Subprofessional Help - the use of aides to plan and execute instructional activities and to perform routine tasks allowed the teacher to be free to teach the pupils reading on an individual basis. The aide also was utilized to work with the individual child or with small groups of children to help reinforce previously taught skills.

Rank 3 Art and Music - emphasis here fell on enhancing creativity of thought in the child through the medium of art and also on the improvement of reading skills through the use of music as another means of providing a different learning experience in reading.

Rank 4 General Elementary and Secondary Education - attention was given to basic skill development and to success in a school situation.

Rank 5 Cultural Enrichment - the use of field trips to various historically significant places, to the museum, and to concerts provided for direct cultural experiences with the community and gave the children the opportunity to

become acquainted with community resources and services available to them.

Service

Rank 1 Food - lunch

Rank 2 Health - dental, medical, and nutritional services

Rank 3 Curriculum Materials Center and Library Services

Rank 4 Waiver of Fees for Books and Supplies

Rank 5 Guidance and Counseling

The approaches which refer to the objective ranked No. 2 are as follows:

Instructional

Rank 1 Reading Instruction - approximately 50 percent of project children had the advantage of remedial and developmental reading instruction over and above what could be provided locally.

Rank 2 Mathematics Instruction - emphasis was placed on mastering basic skills and content matter to improve performance in the classroom and as measured by standardized achievement tests.

Rank 3 Science Instruction

Rank 4 Social Studies/Social Sciences

Rank 5 Cultural Enrichment - this provided a means whereby instruction in language arts, reading, and mathematics was manifested through the direct cultural experiences supplied. Students read about the places visited, wrote stories and descriptions of events, computed miles traveled, and saw movies and filmstrips.

Service

Rank 1 Food - lunch

Rank 2 Health - dental, medical

Rank 3 Guidance and Counseling

Rank 4 Attendance Services

Rank 5 Social Work - home visits

The approaches which refer to the objective ranked No. 3 are as follows:

Instructional

Rank 1 Reading Instruction - approximately 40 percent of class time was spent in developing speaking and listening skills.

Rank 2 Cultural Enrichment Experiences - used as the stimulus and basis for increasing both oral and written language skills. Thus speaking skills, vocabulary, and concept-building related to the day's activities were more meaningful and immediately useful, not theoretical and distant.

Rank 3 English Instruction - oral English expression and communication in most cases occupies 80 percent of the class time for the projects involved.

Rank 4 Teacher Aides and Other Subprofessional Help - aides used to follow up in reading and phonics and reinforce the teacher's daily instruction. Language arts and reading instruction areas were especially considered when placement of teacher aides was made.

Rank 5 Music and Art Instruction - about 80 percent of the class time in music was spent on teaching songs appropriate to the grade level and 20 percent on rhythmic and appreciation skills. About 70 percent of the class time in art was spent on teaching pupils to express themselves through art media and 30 percent on the fundamentals of art.

Service

Rank 1 Food - lunch

Rank 2 Guidance and Counseling

Rank 3 Health Needs - dental and medical

Rank 4 Inservice Training for Staff Personnel

Rank 5 Library Services

The approaches which refer to the objective ranked No. 4 are as follows:

Instructional

Rank 1 Reading Instruction and Language Skills Building - individual grouping by ability to provide for extensive treatment of the pupil's reading problems. Some one to one relationships between teachers and pupils provided for increase in the pupil's confidence and competence in the reading and communication areas.

Rank 2 Cultural Enrichment - to provide pleasurable experiences which also gave students more association with unfamiliar places, besides affording them opportunities to develop an awareness of the community around them.

Rank 3 Mathematics Instruction - pupils were grouped to enhance success in mathematical problem areas relevant to the individual pupil and consequently promote a more positive attitude in the child as a learner.

Rank 4 Teacher Aides and Other Subprofessional Help - utilized in all subject areas to promote individualized attention to instructional needs of the children.

Rank 5 English Instruction

Service

Rank 1 Food - lunch

Rank 2 Health - medical and dental

Rank 3 Guidance and Counseling

Rank 4 Inservice Training for Staff Personnel

Rank 5 School Social Work and Psychological Services

The approaches which refer to the objective ranked No. 5 are as follows:

Instructional

Rank 1 Reading Instruction

Rank 2 Art Instruction

Rank 3 Cultural Improvement

Rank 4 Mathematics Instruction

Rank 5 Physical Education/Recreation

Service

Rank 1 Health Needs - dental and medical

Rank 2 Food - lunch

Rank 3 Clothing

Rank 4 Food - snacks

Rank 5 Psychological Services

D. Title I Activities and Those of Other Federal Programs

Title I activities were supplemented by those of other Federal programs as follows:

ESEA Title II

Title II funds were reported to have been utilized by all of the local units where Title I projects are in effect. Title II funds provided library and instructional materials, such as reference books, books at easy-reading levels, filmstrips, transparencies, and recordings, in order to supplement the materials provided under Title I for the various projects undertaken by these local units.

ESEA Title III

Seven of the local units reported direct or indirect use of Title III funds in regard to Title I activities. For some of the units which will be initiating supplementary educational centers, children already in the Title I programs will be eligible to participate in these centers. Title III activities also provided some personnel to be used in Title I programs. For instance, in one local unit a nurse who was staffed under the funds of Title III was needed to perform duties for a reading project funded under Title I. In another local unit, science resource teachers

from Title III projects were utilized for two schools which were participating in a Title I educational development project.

ESEA Title V

Only one local unit reported any supplementation of Title I activities by those of Title V. This unit is Montgomery County which, at the request of the Maryland State Department of Education, is operating a Demonstration Center for Teacher Education in one of its non-Title I elementary schools. Video equipment, installed for this project, was used for training classroom observers as a part of the Title I evaluation effort.

NDEA Title III

Funds appropriated under Title III provided for supplementary books, materials of instruction, and visual aid equipment in the area of language arts which were utilized by two local units in reading improvement programs.

U.S. Department of Agriculture Food Program

The services rendered under this program have so far been made available to seven of the local units. The benefits of the program included moneys utilized through the county school lunch program for special milk and for hot lunches to provide many Title I children with a hot, nutritious meal. Surplus food commodities were also supplied to the local units to supplement the school lunch program.

Community Action Agency

Twelve of the local units have found the activities of this agency helpful in planning and implementing Title I programs and activities. The units have found the CAA important to them in developing communication and a sensitivity concerning the problems with which the unit must deal. Communication with the CAA has also resulted in coordination of Head Start programs with pre-school programs.

Welfare Administration Programs

Six of the local units have found the Welfare Department indispensable in identifying project children and families and in assuring these persons of nutritional and social services.

Neighborhood Youth Corps

Fifteen of the local units noted that their Title I activities had been supplemented or had benefited from the Corps activities. Personnel from the NYC worked in various jobs that assisted the professional staff to carry out the various projects. For instance, the NYC student employees served as secretaries and custodians in several of the summer projects. They also were employed to assist in Title I projects as teacher aides and cafeteria workers. Besides giving support to the Title I projects, the NYC, in turn, also furnished many project students who might have had to quit school with the means whereby they could continue.

Medical Aid to Indigent Families

In terms of the local units, medical aid was used to supplement the services of Title I. Various hospitalization and other medical fees, which would have fallen to Title I, were paid by medical aid benefits under Title XIX.

E. Staff Development and Utilization

1. SEA Activities

The supervisors from the state educational agency made periodic visits to the LEAs and schools participating in Title I activities. During these visits, administrators and supervisors from the LEA joined the staff from the SEA, observed instructional activities, and discussed and participated in activities which might make improvements in learning opportunities for deprived youth. Conferences with the LEAs' staffs on utilization of university personnel and facilities were held on each of these visits. In addition, each local educational agency develops, in consultation with the SEA's staff, institutes or workshops which precede the opening of school or follow the closing of school. These are usually of a two-week duration. Some LEAs, which do not have the extensive pre- or post-school institute, conduct periodical inservice training sessions. Regardless of the period when the training is given, the LEAs consider SEA staff members as an integral part of a team which is interested in staff development.

2. LEA Activities

Rank 1 Inservice Training - in the area of staff development, most of the projects deemed inservice training the

most effective method of developing Title I project personnel.

This inservice training consisted of an inservice session of one to three weeks prior to or at the beginning of the project. In 75 percent of the projects, these inservice sessions continued throughout the duration of the program on a biweekly or monthly basis.

The training in these sessions was usually provided by local administration personnel, such as the project directors, curriculum supervisors, and elementary and secondary school supervisors. However, university consultants (mostly from the University of Maryland) and outside consultants also conducted the inservice training for 25 percent of the Title I projects.

The participants for the training session usually included all of the instructional staff for the project such as teachers and teacher aides. In approximately 25 percent of the projects, the school nurses, school social workers, principals, and other school supervisors were also included.

The focus of the training centered on the following areas:

a. Different teaching techniques

b. New instructional devices

c. Practices and techniques that proved successful during the project

d. Organization of classes

e. Grouping procedures

f. Ways of utilizing play activities to improve Academic skills

g. The proper way of using and selecting instructional materials purchased under Title I

h. Background in the problems of learning as related to the disadvantaged.

Rank 2 Staff Utilization - in the area of staff utilization for Title I projects, attempts were made for most projects to utilize to the maximum the personnel resources available. This applied not only to Title I staff but also to other professional and central office staff. Supervisors, principals, school social workers, psychologists, and other professional staff furnished supportive help in the design and implementation of Title I. Instructional and general supervisors helped Title I teachers and aides to improve their overall competence in areas concerning the project.

For the most part, staff personnel were used according to particular skills and competencies with regard to the specific objectives of the Title I project. However, Title I and non-Title I professional staff were called upon to train aides, conduct inservice sessions, promote parent involvement, act as resource persons for other staff members to disseminate information, and act as exponents of good public relations.

Rank 3 Recruitment Methods - local units resorted to a variety of methods in securing the necessary staff to carry out the objective of the Title I projects.

In some cases, surveys were conducted to determine a tentative list of interested and qualified staff members who could be considered. Substitute-teacher lists and recommendations from staff members also provided sources which could be used in securing staff. Several local units publicized their programs through the press and radio, through the Welfare and Health Departments, and through the Community Action Agency in order to solicit applicants. In regard to some of the preschool projects, applicants were solicited among those who had acquired previous experience in the OEO Head Start programs or workshops. In one instance, parents of low-income families who wished to become aides to regular teachers were recruited for the projects.

The actual selection of applicants was for the most part performed by the personnel departments and other county officials.

F. Involvement of Nonpublic School Children

1. Nonpublic school children in Maryland participated in most of the activities which were made available for the public school children. The most effective method used by the local educational agencies was in Baltimore City. Here large numbers of children are involved, but the effectiveness was due to the employment of liaison persons who are always present during any discussions concerning ESEA Title I activities. When projects are developed, written, and put into operation, the persons mentioned always asked the question, "To what extent and how will nonpublic schools be involved in the activity under discussion?" Keeping such a liaison with nonpublic school personnel on a continuing basis has proved most effective.

2. The LEAs employed three means to involve nonpublic school children. These means are listed below.

   a. All LEAs reported that the first step was to contact the area archdiocese and explain the provisions and services for nonpublic children.

   b. Ninety percent of the LEAs involving nonpublic children reported that, as a second step, they communicated directly with principals of nonpublic schools in order to establish cooperation arrangements for pupil participation.

   c. Twenty percent of the LEAs reported that some direct contacts (invitational) by means of surveys, were made with parents of nonpublic school children. These contacts explained the provisions of the projects and solicited the parents' cooperation for their children.

3. The most commonly funded types of projects involving nonpublic children may be categorized as "Reading Improvement Instruction with Supplementary Cultural Enrichment Activities." Ninety-five percent of the Title I activities for nonpublic school pupils occurred on nonpublic school grounds. The prevalence of activities and services for nonpublic pupils are ranked below.

   Rank 1 Nonpublic school teachers' direct participation in reading workshops, inservice training, and consultant services.

Rank 2 Materials related to reading were made direct to Title I pupils in the nonpublic schools.

Rank 3 Nonpublic school pupil participation in field trips and visits to cultrual centers along with public school pupils.

Rank 4 Provision of free lunches and milk to nonpublic school pupils.

Rank 5 Provision of dental service to nonpublic school pupils.

G. Programs Designed for Handicapped Children

1. The regulations specifically require LEAs to include activities for handicapped children. Maryland has interpreted this to mean that handicapped children are automatically eligible to participate; therefore, whatever programs are designed, attention must be given to activities for handicapped children. The supervisors of special education serve on the Title I Advisory Committee. This Committee is charged with the responsibility of evaluating and approving all projects for funding.

These supervisors of special education make recommendations for additions, modifications, or general inclusion of activities for handicapped children during the time when the projects are under consideration for approval. In this way, projects are under the scrutiny of supervisors of special education during the most critical period before they are funded. The same supervisors visit the projects while they are in operation in the local school systems.

Purchase of glasses and hearing aides are two of the most frequent activities which school systems use to help children whose handicaps can easily be overcome. These purchases are always preceded by appropriate diagnosis.

A special school was instituted and set up for mentally retarded children in Baltimore during the summer of 1967.

2. One-third of the LEAs reported that handicapped pupils were provided for in their Title I projects. In most instances, the LEAs reported that the same activities considered effective for regular pupils were equally effective for the handicapped. The effective activities in two projects, designed especially for handicapped pupils, are listed below according to the type of handicap.

Partially Seeing Children

1. A concentrated program (summer), utilizing practical aspects of reading and arithmetic to supplement the regular itinerant program of instruction.

2. Provision of print blocks and audio devices as instructional aids.

3. Special instruction in the social arts (communication with other people).

4. Special instruction in improving mobility skill (the operational aspects of the pupil's environment, such as traffic, buildings, appliances, etc.).

Severe Auditory Problems

1. Cultural enrichment activities as the stimulus for increasing both oral and written language.

2. Speech therapy to improve articulation.

3. Physical education to improve social attitudes and to develop self-confidence.

4. Music activities as a new dimension to hearing.

5. Employment of teen-age (auditory-handicapped) teachers aids. The handicapped aides provided models of maturity for the younger handicapped pupils.

3. PROBLEMS RESOLVED

The major problems which face educators in Maryland as they attempt to improve educational opportunities and achievement for disadvantaged youth are as follows:

a. Finding sufficient funds and having them available when needed in time for appropriate planning.

b. Finding ways of involving parents in the education of their children.

c. Securing a sufficient number of adequately trained teachers who understand the problem of educating disadvantaged youth.

d. Securing a sufficient number of specialists (psychologists, counselors, etc.) to work in Title I programs.

e. Helping society to become aware of and see the problem which schools face in this era of social evolution.

Perhaps there is no one single factor or approach which would resolve the problems listed above. It is believed, however, that if the appropriations could be made sufficiently far enough in advance so that school systems would know before the close of school (in June) what funds are going to be available, they would be in a better position to plan the wisest use of the funds. They could develop programs that would more nearly meet the needs of pupils and certainly they could develop programs during the summer months for the education of teachers.

MARYLAND

TABULAR DATA
TITLE I, ESEA

(Fiscal Year 1967)

MARYLAND*: Attendance is not recorded by Grade. Figures shown represent attenda summed over grades: 1 through 6; 7 through 8; and 9 through 12.

AVERAGE DAILY ATTENDANCE AND AVERAGE DAILY MEMBERSHIP RATES FOR TITLE I PROJECT SCHOOLS COMPARED WITH ALL OTHER PUBLIC SCHOOLS IN THE LEA

TABLE I

GRADE	1964 - 1965						1965 - 1966						1966 - 1967					
	Title I Schools				All Other Public Schools		Title I Schools				All Other Public Schools		Title I Schools				All Other Public Schools	
	ALL		1/3 or More Participants[1]				All		1/3 or More Participants[1]				All		1/3 or More Participants[1]			
	ADA	ADM	ADA	ADM	ADA	ADM	ADA	ADM	ADA	ADM	ADA	ADM	ADA	ADM	ADA	ADM	ADA	ADM
12th	1197	1273			1122	1170	1279	1272	407	454	1859	1982	505	530			3055	3288
11th																		
10th																		
9th																		
8th	834	879	63	68	687	715	834	884	394	433	1137	1200	810	846	189	201	1358	1462
7th																		
6th	3404	3604	124	132	1418	1496	3378	3557	320	880	3623	3843	3387	3593	879	934	3412	3633
5th																		
4th																		
3rd																		
2nd																		
1st																		
Pre-Kgn.																		
Kgn..																		
Total public school enroll-ment	5756		200		3381		5713		1767		7025		5108		1153		8420	
													126	139	17	18	27	37

[1]Those Schools in which 1/3 or more of the student enrollment participated in Title 1 programs.

*Data in this table are based on the reports of three Local School Agencies.

MARYLAND*: Attendance is not recorded by grade. Figures shown represent attendance summed over grades: 1 through 6; 7 through 9; and 10 through 12.

AVERAGE DAILY ATTENDANCE AND AVERAGE DAILY MEMBERSHIP RATES FOR TITLE I PROJECT SCHOOLS COMPARED WITH ALL OTHER PUBLIC SCHOOLS IN THE LEA

TABLE I

GRADE	1964 - 1965						1965 - 1966						1966 - 1967					
	Title I Schools				All Other Public Schools		Title I Schools				All Other Public Schools		Title I Schools				All Other Public Schools	
	ALL		1/3 or More Participants[1]				All		1/3 or More Participants[1]				All		1/3 or More Participants[1]			
	ADA	ADM	ADA	ADM	ADA	ADM	ADA	ADM	ADA	ADM	ADA	ADM	ADA	ADM	ADA	ADM	ADA	ADM
12th	6153	6639			19595	21057	5705	6169			20235	21940	6132	6647			20538	22193
11th																		
10th																		
9th	7867	8429			16439	17371	8024	8636			17046	18138	8792	9451			23043	24480
8th																		
7th																		
6th	17512	18629	1062	1135	42966	45505	17667	18908	1026	1085	44298	47063	22512	23788	3910	4117	48745	51436
5th																		
4th																		
3rd																		
2nd																		
1st																		
Pre-Kgn.																		
Kgn..																	338	376
Total public school enrollment	33,697		1,135		83,933		33,713		1,085		87,141		39,886		4,117		98,485	

[1]Those Schools in which 1/3 or more of the student enrollment participated in Title 1 programs.

*Data in this table are based on the reports of four Local School Agencies.

MARYLAND*: Attendance is not recorded by grade. Figures shown represent attendance summed over grades: 1 through 6; and 7 through 12.

AVERAGE DAILY ATTENDANCE AND AVERAGE DAILY MEMBERSHIP RATES FOR TITLE I PROJECT SCHOOLS COMPARED WITH ALL OTHER PUBLIC SCHOOLS IN THE LEA

TABLE I

GRADE	1964 - 1965						1965 - 1966						1966 - 1967					
	Title I Schools				All Other Public Schools		Title I Schools				All Other Public Schools		Title I Schools				All Other Public Schools	
	ALL		1/3 or More Participants[1]				All		1/3 or More Participants[1]				All		1/3 or More Participants[1]			
	ADA	ADM	ADA	ADM	ADA	ADM	ADA	ADM	ADA	ADM	ADA	ADM	ADA	ADM	ADA	ADM	ADA	ADM
12th	7257	7665			923	970	4609	7257			2203	2305	5739	6049			2187	2288
11th																		
10th																		
9th																		
8th																		
7th																		
6th	3494	3679			4245	4369	3505	3669			4189	4360	3758	3936			3959	4152
5th																		
4th																		
3rd																		
2nd																		
1st																		
Pre-Kgn.																		
Kgn..																		
Total public school enrollment	11,344				5,339		10,926				6,665		9,985				6,440	

[1]Those Schools in which 1/3 or more of the student enrollment participated in Title 1 programs.

*Data in this table are based on the reports of one Local School Agency.

MARYLAND*

STUDENTS IN TITLE I PROJECT HIGH SCHOOLS CONTINUING EDUCATION BEYOND HIGH SCHOOL
COMPARED WITH OTHER HIGH SCHOOLS IN LEA

TABLE 3

	1963-1964			1964-1965			1965-1966			1966-1967		
	Title I Schools		All Other Public Schools	Title I Schools		All Other Public Schools	Title I Schools		All Other Public Schools	Title I Schools		All Other Public Schools
	All	1/3 or More Participants[1]		All	1/3 or More Participants[1]		All	1/3 or More Participants[1]		All	1/3 or More Participants[1]	
Total Number of Graduates	1298	1715	5469	1677	2172	7488	1987	2100	8236	115	1793	687
Number of Schools	7	14	20	9	17	27	12	17	32	1	13	7
Mean Size of Graduating Class	185	123	274	186	128	277	166	124	257	115	138	98
Number of Pupils Continuing Education[2]	446	587	2780	604	678	3817	645	724	3838	35	683	221

[1] Those schools in which 1/3 or more of the student enrollment participated in Title I programs.

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

*Data in this table are based on the reports of eleven Local School Agencies.

MARYLA...*

DROPOUT RATES (HOLDING POWER) FOR TITLE I SCHOOLS COMPARED WITH OTHER PUBLIC SCHOOLS IN THE LEA

TABLE 2

GRADE	1964-1965			1965-1966			1966-1967		
	Title I Schools		All Other Public Schools	Title I Schools		All Other Public Schools	Title I Schools		All Other Public Schools
	All	1/3 or more[1]		All	1/3 or more[1]		All	1/3 or more[1]	
12th	26	5	42	18	14	85	18	5	51
11th	27	14	62	44	48	187	32	26	108
10th	50	10	53	48	31	228	67	16	173
9th	52	13	58	42	34	201	71	19	177
8th	24	25	17	37	28	101	10	23	120
7th	43	15	11	15	8	88	8	8	44
6th and below if applicable	0	0	3	0	0	1	2	4	33
No. of schools	18	11	17	20	18	59	32	19	34
Total No. of Students	10636	2496	13030	14615	6478	46776	16450	7198	46326
No. of dropouts	222	92	246	204	163	891	208	101	706

[1] Those schools in which 1/3 or more of the student enrollment participated in Title I programs.

* Data in this table are based on the reports of nine Local School Agencies.

Each of the tables included herein contain test data based on the reports for several individual Title I projects. Because of the diversity of tests administered for the various programs and the different methods of expressing the test scores it was impossible to combine the tables in any reliable manner.

DATA FOR PROJECT "A"

TABLE 2 (Part 1) STANDARDIZED ACHIEVEMENT TEST RESULTS, 1/ TITLE I (ESEA) 1966-67
(see instructions below)

Grade 4

Name of Test and Each Subsection	Month & Year Administered	Form	Number of Students	G. E. Mean 2/	G. E. Std.Dev. 2/	Number of Students Scoring, According to National Norm: 25th PR. and below	26th to 50th PR.	51st to 75th PR.	75th PR. and above
PRE-TEST SCORE RESULTS 3/									
IOWA SILENT READING									
Comprehension	Dec., 1966	D	191	3.10	1.56	106	39	33	13
POST-TEST SCORE RESULTS 3/	Month & Year Administered								
IOWA SILENT READING									
Comprehension	June, 1967	C	191	3.27	1.46	83	59	39	10

1/ List those groups which took pre- and post-tests, including students in the groups who were tested only once during the project period.

2/ If not raw score, indicate type score reported for each test.

3/ List the results for group having had only one testing.

INSTRUCTIONS

This table may be used to report achievement tests results for pre and posttest scores for groups in which certain pupils were present for only one of the testing sessions (pre or post). Therefore, the numbers for pre- and post-tests may not be the same. This table may also be used to record test data for projects in which there was only one testing, e.g., pre or post. Report data for achievement tests, or achievement batteries only. Representative sampling is encouraged. Please use a separate table for each subtest or grade.

TABLE 2 (Part 1) STANDARDIZED ACHIEVEMENT TEST RESULTS, 1/ TITLE I (ESEA) 1966-67
(see instructions below)

Grade 5

Name of Test and Each Subsection	Month & Year Administered	Form	Number of Students	G. E. Mean 2/	G. E. Std.Dev. 2/	Number of Students Scoring, According to National Norm: 25th PR. and below	26th to 50th PR.	51st to 75th PR.	75th PR. and above
PRE-TEST SCORE RESULTS 3/									
IOWA SILENT READING									
Comprehension	Dec., 1966	D	165	4.34	1.96	85	43	30	7
	Month & Year Administered		POST-TEST SCORE RESULTS 3/						
IOWA SILENT READING									
Comprehension	June, 1967	C	157	4.40	2.00	78	40	27	12

1/ List those groups which took pre- and post-tests, including students in the groups who were tested only once during the project period.

2/ If not raw score, indicate type score reported for each test.

3/ List the results for group having had only one testing.

INSTRUCTIONS

This table may be used to report achievement tests results for pre and posttest scores for groups in which certain pupils were present for only one of the testing sessions (pre or post). Therefore, the numbers for pre- and post-tests may not be the same. This table may also be used to record test data for projects in which there was only one testing, e.g., pre or post. Report data for achievement tests, or achievement batteries only. Representative sampling is encouraged. Please use a separate table for each subtest or grade.

TABLE 2 (Part 1)

STANDARDIZED ACHIEVEMENT TEST RESULTS, 1/ TITLE I (ESEA) 1966-67
(see instructions below)

Grade 6

Name of Test and Each Subsection	Month & Year Administered	Form	Number of Students	G. E. Mean 2/	G. E. Std.Dev. 2/	Number of Students Scoring, According to National Norm: 25th PR. and below	26th to 50th PR.	51st to 75th PR.	75th PR. and above
PRE-TEST SCORE RESULTS 3/									
IOWA SILENT READING									
Comprehension	Dec., 1966	D	166	5.22	2.00	83	51	25	7
POST-TEST SCORE RESULTS 3/									
IOWA SILENT READING									
Comprehension	June, 1966	G	170	5.52	2.75	78	51	20	21

1/ List those groups which took pre- and post-tests, including students in the groups who were tested only once during the project period.

2/ If not raw score, indicate type score reported for each test.

3/ List the results for group having had only one testing.

INSTRUCTIONS

This table may be used to report achievement tests results for pre and posttest scores for groups in which certain pupils were present for only one of the testing sessions (pre or post). Therefore, the numbers for pre- and post-tests may not be the same. This table may also be used to record test data for projects in which there was only one testing, e.g., pre or post. Report data for achievement tests, or achievement batteries only. Representative sampling is encouraged. Please use a separate table for each subtest or grade.

DATA FOR PROJECT "B"

TABLE 1 (Part 1)

STANDARDIZED ACHIEVEMENT TEST RESULTS, TITLE I (ESEA) 1966-67
GROUPS TAKING PRE- AND POST-TESTS
(See instructions below)

Grade 2

Name of Test and Each Subsection	Month & Year Administered	Form	Number of Students 1/	Raw Score Mean 2/	Raw Score Std. Deviation 2/	Number of Students Scoring, According to National Norm: 25th percentile and below	26th to 50th percentile	51st to 75th percentile	75th percentile and above
PRE-TEST SCORE RESULTS									
Metropolitan Achievement Test (Reading)	October 1966	A	104	16.625	6.055	13	35	44	12
	Month & Year Administered	POST-TEST SCORE RESULTS							
Same as pre-test	May 1967	B	104	29.019	10.454	32	35	18	19

1/ Include here only students within the group, who continued through the project and were present to take both pre and post tests. The number of students who took the pre-test on this chart will be the same as the number who took the post-test.

2/ If not raw score, indicate type score reported for each test.

Student t - value for pre- and post-test scores

t = -12.1939*

***Significant at .01**

INSTRUCTIONS

Report data on the most widely used standardized tests in the project. Use this table separately for subtests and grade level. Report data from Achievement tests or achievement batteries only. Representative sampling for subtests and grades is encouraged.

TABLE 1 (Part 1)

STANDARDIZED ACHIEVEMENT TEST RESULTS, TITLE I (ESEA) 1966-67
GROUPS TAKING PRE- AND POST-TESTS
(See instructions below)

Grade 3

Name of Test and Each Subsection	Month & Year Administered	Form	Number of Students 1/	Raw Score Mean 2/	Raw Score Std. Deviation 2/	Number of Students Scoring, According to National Norm: 25th percentile and below	26th to 50th percentile	51st to 75th percentile	75th percentile and above
PRE-TEST SCORE RESULTS									
Iowa Test of Basic Skills (Reading)	October 1966	1	82	16.037	5.849	36	30	16	-
	Month & Year Administered	POST-TEST SCORE RESULTS							
Same as pre-test	May 1967	2	82	22.476	8.251	26	34	17	5

1/ Include here only students within the group, who continued through the project and were present to take both pre and post tests. The number of students who took the pre-test on this chart will be the same as the number who took the post-test.

2/ If not raw score, indicate type score reported for each test.

Student t - value for pre- and post-test scores

t = -7.8735*

***Significant at .01**

INSTRUCTIONS

Report data on the most widely used standardized tests in the project. Use this table separately for subtests and grade level. Report data from Achievement tests or achievement batteries only. Representative sampling for subtests and grades is encouraged.

TABLE 1 (Part 1)

STANDARDIZED ACHIEVEMENT TEST RESULTS, TITLE I (ESEA) 1966-67
GROUPS TAKING PRE- AND POST-TESTS
(See instructions below)

Grade 5

Name of Test and Each Subsection	Month & Year Administered	Form	Number of Students 1/	Raw Score Mean 2/	Raw Score Std. Deviation 2/	Number of Students Scoring, According to National Norm: 25th percentile and below	26th to 50th percentile	51st to 75th percentile	75th percentile and above
PRE-TEST SCORE RESULTS									
Iowa Test of Basic Skills (Reading)	October 1966	1	107	23.804	8.560	46	45	14	2
	Month & Year Administered	POST-TEST SCORE RESULTS							
Same as pre-test	May 1967	2	107	31.608	11.814	47	40	15	5

1/ Include here only students within the group, who continued through the project and were present to take both pre and post tests. The number of students who took the pre-test on this chart will be the same as the number who took the post-test.

2/ If not raw score, indicate type score reported for each test.

Student t - value for pre- and post-test scores

t = -8.6333*

***Significant at .01**

INSTRUCTIONS

Report data on the most widely used standardized tests in the project. Use this table separately for subtests and grade level. Report data from Achievement tests or achievement batteries only. Representative sampling for subtests and grades is encouraged.

TABLE 1 (Part 1)

STANDARDIZED ACHIEVEMENT TEST RESULTS, TITLE I (ESEA) 1966-67
GROUPS TAKING PRE- AND POST-TESTS
(See instructions below)

Grade 6

Name of Test and Each Subsection	Month & Year Administered	Form	Number of Students 1/	Raw Score Mean 2/	Raw Score Std. Deviation 2/	Number of Students Scoring, According to National Norm: 25th percentile and below	26th to 50th percentile	51st to 75th percentile	75th percentile and above
PRE-TEST SCORE RESULTS									
Iowa Test of Basic Skills (Reading)	October 1966	1	90	22.900	7.556	55	26	9	-
	Month & Year Administered	POST-TEST SCORE RESULTS							
Same as pre-test	May 1967	2	90	27.211	9.766	55	28	6	1

1/ Include here only students within the group, who continued through the project and were present to take both pre and post tests. The number of students who took the pre-test on this chart will be the same as the number who took the post-test.

2/ If not raw score, indicate type score reported for each test.

INSTRUCTIONS

Report data on the most widely used standardized tests in the project. Use this table separately for subtests and grade level. Report data from Achievement tests or achievement batteries only. Representative sampling for subtests and grades is encouraged.

Student t - value for pre- and post-test scores

t = -6.8322*

***Significant at .01**

DATA FOR PROJECT "C"

TABLE 1 (Part 1)

STANDARDIZED ACHIEVEMENT TEST RESULTS, TITLE I (ESEA) 1966-67
GROUPS TAKING PRE- AND POST-TESTS
(See instructions below)

Grade 8

Name of Test and Each Subsection	Month & Year Administered	Form	Number of Students 1/	Raw Score Mean 2/	Raw Score Std. Deviation 2/	Number of Students Scoring, According to National Norm: 25th percentile and below	26th to 50th percentile	51st to 75th percentile	75th percentile and above
PRE-TEST SCORE RESULTS									
Nelson Reading Test	Nov, 1966	A	12	15	N.A.	10	1	1	
	Month & Year Administered	POST-TEST SCORE RESULTS							
Nelson Reading Test	June, 1967	B	12	26.6	N.A.	7	3	2	

1/ Include here only students within the group, who continued through the project and were present to take both pre and post tests. The number of students who took the pre-test on this chart will be the same as the number who took the post-test.

2/ If not raw score, indicate type score reported for each test.

INSTRUCTIONS

Report data on the most widely used standardized tests in the project. Use this table separately for subtests and grade level. Report data from Achievement tests or achievement batteries only. Representative sampling for subtests and grades is encouraged.

TABLE 1 (Part 1)

STANDARDIZED ACHIEVEMENT TEST RESULTS, TITLE I (ESEA) 1966-67
GROUPS TAKING PRE- AND POST-TESTS
(See instructions below)

Grade 9

Name of Test and Each Subsection	Month & Year Administered	Form	Number of Students 1/	Raw Score Mean 2/	Raw Score Std. Deviation 2/	Number of Students Scoring, According to National Norm			
						25th percentile and below	26th to 50th percentile	51st to 75th percentile	75th percentile and above
PRE-TEST SCORE RESULTS									
Nelson Reading Test	Nov. 1966	A	15	16.8	N.A.	11	4		
	Month & Year Administered	POST-TEST SCORE RESULTS							
Nelson Reading Test	June, 1967	B	15	28.7	N.A.	7	6	2	

1/ Include here only students within the group, who continued through the project and were present to take both pre and post tests. The number of students who took the pre-test on this chart will be the same as the number who took the post-test.

2/ If not raw score, indicate type score reported for each test.

INSTRUCTIONS

Report data on the most widely used standardized tests in the project. Use this table separately for subtests and grade level. Report data from Achievement tests or achievement batteries only. Representative sampling for subtests and grades is encouraged.

DATA FOR PROJECT "D"

DATA FOR PROJECT "D"

TABLE 1 (Part 1)

Standardized Achievement Test Results

Grade 2P

New Developmental Reading Tests — Bond - Balow - Hoyt

Name of Test and Each Subsection	Month & Yr. Administered	Form	No. of Students	Raw Score Mean 2	Raw Score Std. Deviation2
Lower Primary Reading PreTest					
Part I Word Recognition				3.12	2.74
Part II Comprehending Sig. Ideas	5-66	L-1	16	6.56	6.75
Part III " " Specific Instr.				1.25	1.56
Upper Primary Reading Posttest					
Part I Word Recognition				2.68	3.57
Part II Comprehending Sig. Ideas	5-67	U-1	16	7.93	5.15
Part III " " Specific Instr.				2.56	2.09
Grade 2 ST					
Lower Primary Reading Pre-test					
Part I Word Recognition				6.42	8.09
Part II Comprehending Sig. Ideas	5-66	L-1	21	10.19	4.48
Part III " " Specific Instr.				5.47	2.38
Upper Primary Reading Post-test					
Part I Word Recognition				15.61	6.73
Part II Comprehending Sig. Ideas	5-67	U-1	21	12.28	6.47
Part III " " Specific Instr.				7.04	5.28
Grade 3S					
Upper Primary Reading Pre-test					
Part I Word Recognition				19.39	8.72
Part II Comprehending Sig. Ideas	5-66	U-1	23	21.39	6.85
Part III " " Specific Instr.				13.13	6.76
Upper Primary Reading Post-test					
Part I Word Recognition				26.65	7.71
Part II Comprehending Sig. Ideas	5-67	U-1	23	27.65	6.48
Part III " " Specific Instr.				16.30	6.61
Grade 3D					
Upper Primary Reading Pre-test					
Part I Word Recognition				4.70	2.87
Part II Comprehending Sig. Ideas	5-66	U-1	17	12.23	3.27
Part III " " Specific Instr.				3.88	3.58
Upper Primary Reading Post-test					
Part I Word Recognition				11.82	7.86
Part II Comprehending Sig. Ideas	5-67	U-1	17	15.76	5.09
Part III " " Specific Instr.				8.41	5.79
Grade 4F					
Upper Primary Reading Pre-test					
Part I Word Recognition				13.62	9.75
Part II Comprehending Sig. Ideas	5-66	U-1	8	16.12	7.82
Part III " " Specific Instr.				7.62	4.93
Upper Primary Reading Post-test	Developmental	Reading Tests		Bond - Clymer - Hoyt	
Part I Word Recognition				2.25	2.38
Part II Comprehending Sig. Ideas	5-67	IR-A	8	2.37	1.41
Part III " " Specific Instr.				1.62	2.00
Part IV Reading to Evaluate				1.25	1.00
Part V Reading to Appreciate				3.50	2.05

TABLE 1 (Part 1)

Standardized Achievement Test Results

Name of Test and Each Subsection	Month & Yr. Administered	Form	No. of Students	Raw Score Mean	Raw Score Std. Deviation2
Grade 4S New Developmental Reading Tests Bond - Balow - Hoyt					
Upper Primary Reading Pre-test					
Part I Word Recognition				23.66	5.75
Part II Comprehending Sig. Ideas	5-66	U-1	18	23.00	9.59
Part III " " Specific Instr.				14.33	5.54
Developmental Reading Tests Bond - Clymer - Hoyt					
Part I Basic Vocabulary				8.16	3.57
Part II Reading to Retain Inf.	5-67	IR-A	18	5.72	6.23
Part III Reading to Organize				5.83	2.97
Part IV Reading to Evaluate				3.94	1.87
Part V Reading to Appreciate				4.72	2.74
Developmental Reading Tests Bond - Clymer - Hoyt					
Grade 5 Pre-test					
Part I Basic Vocabulary				6.63	4.84
Part II Reading to Retain Inf.	5-66	IR-A	19	4.89	2.60
Part III Reading to Organize				6.00	2.67
Part IV Reading to Evaluate				4.73	1.95
Part V Reading to Appreciate				4.31	1.85
Post-test					
Part I Basic Vocabulary				19.36	6.36
Part II Reading to Retain Inf.	5-67	IR-A	19	6.63	2.66
Part III Reading to Organize				6.63	2.39
Part IV Reading to Evaluate				4.05	2.35
Part V. Reading to Appreciate				5.05	2.93
Grade 6L Pre-test					
Part I Basic Vocabulary				8.83	5.40
Part II Reading to Retain Inf.	5-66	IR-A	6	5.16	1.96
Part III Reading to Organize				7.83	1.59
Part IV Reading to Evaluate				4.00	1.64
Part V Reading to Appreciate				4.00	1.73
Post-test					
Part I Basic Vocabulary				14.00	4.54
Part II Reading to Retain Inf.	5-67	IR-A	6	6.33	.07
Part III Reading to Organize				8.00	2.08
Part IV Reading to Evaluate				4.66	2.37
Part V Reading to Appreciate				4.83	1.78
Grade 6S Pre-test					
Part I Basic Vocabulary				4.95	4.73
Part II Reading to Retain Inf.	5-66	IR-A	20	4.50	2.17
Part III Reading to Organize				4.70	3.21
Part IV Reading to Evaluate				3.60	2.24
Part V Reading to Appreciate				3.80	2.79
Post-test					
Part I Basic Vocabulary				4.60	4.63
Part II Reading to Retain Inf.	5-67	IR-A	20	5.30	2.59
Part III Reading to Organize				3.35	2.93
Part IV Reading to Evaluate				3.20	1.72
Part V Reading to Appreciate				3.60	2.57

Table 2 (Part 1)

Standardized Achievement Test Results

New Developmental Reading Tests Bond - Balow - Hoyt

Grade 3DS

Name of Test and Each Subsection	Month & Yr. Administered	Form	No. of Students	Raw Score Mean 2	Raw Score Std. Deviation 2
Upper Primary Reading Pre-test					
Part I Word Recognition				13.00	12.00
Part II Comprehending Sig. Ideas	5-66	U-1	2	16.50	3.50
Part III " " Specific Instr.				9.00	2.00
Upper Primary Reading Post-test					
Part I Word Recognition				24.50	6.89
Part II Comprehending Sig. Ideas	5-67	U-1	6	22.83	5.94
Part III " " Specific Instr.				12.83	5.08

DATA FOR PROJECT "E"

Data For One Project - Maryland

TABLE 1 (t 1)

STANDARDIZED ACHIEVEMENT TEST RESULTS, TITLE I (ESEA) 1966-67
GROUPS TAKING Pre- AND POST-TESTS
(See instructions below)

Grade 2

Name of Test and Each Subsection	Month & Year Administered	Form	Number of Students1/	Raw Score Mean 2/	Raw Score Std. Deviation 2/	Number of Students Scoring, According to National Norm: 25th Percentile And Below	26th To 50th Percentile	51st To 75th Percentile	75th Percentile And Above
PRE-TEST SCORE RESULTS									
Metropolitan Achievement Test Reading	1/67	A	143	13.45	5.7	105	35	3	0
POST-TEST SCORE RESULTS									
	Month & Year Administered								
Metropolitan Achievement Test Reading	5/67	A	143	19.82	9.9	88	34	9	12

1/ Include here only students within the group, who continued through the project and were present to take both pre and post tests. The number of students who took the pre-test on this chart will be the same as the number who took the post-test.

2/ If not raw score, indicate type score reported for each test.

INSTRUCTIONS

Report data on the most widely used standardized tests in the project. Use this table separately for subtests and grade level. Report data from Achievement tests or achievement batteries only. Representative sampling for subtests and grades is encouraged.

t = 8.75

Significant at .01 level

142° of freedom at .01 level = 2.576
142° of freedom at .05 level = 1.96

Data for One Project - Maryland

TABLE 1 (Pa 1)

STANDARDIZED ACHIEVEMENT TEST RESULTS, TITLE I (ESEA) 1966-67
GROUPS TAKING PRE- AND POST-TESTS
(See instructions below)

Grade 3

Name of Test and Each Subsection	Month & Year Administered	Form	Number of Students1/	Raw Score Mean 2/	Raw Score Std. Deviation 2/	Number of Students Scoring, According to National Norm: 25th Percentile And Below	26th To 50th Percentile	51st To 75th Percentile	75th Percentile And Above
PRE-TEST SCORE RESULTS									
Iowa Test of Basic Skills Reading	11/66	1	87	17.21	5.95	36	26	21	4
POST-TEST SCORE RESULTS	Month & Year Administered 5								
Iowa Test of Basic Skills Reading	5/67	1	87	22.13	8.7	34	29	16	8

1/ Include here only students within the group, who continued through the project and were present to take both pre and post tests. The number of students who took the pre-test on this chart will be the same as the number who took the post-test.

2/ If not raw score, indicate type score reported for each test.

INSTRUCTIONS

Report data on the most widely used standardized tests in the project. Use this table separately for subtests and grade level. Report data from Achievement tests or achievement batteries only. Representative sampling for subtests and grades is encouraged.

t = 5.49

Significant at .01 level

86° of freedom .01 = 2.64
86° of freedom .05 = 1.99

Data For One Project - Maryland

TABLE 1 (P[illegible] 1)

STANDARDIZED ACHIEVEMENT TEST [illegible]SULTS, TITLE I (ESEA) 1966-67
GROUPS TAKING PRE- AND POST-TESTS
(See instructi ns below)

Grade 4

Name of Test and Each Subsection	Month & Year Administered	Form	Number of Students1/	Raw Score Mean 2/	Raw Score Std. Deviation 2/	Number of Students Scoring, According to National Norm: 25th Percentile And Below	26th To 50th Percentile	51st To 75th Percentile	75th Percentile And Above
PRE-TEST SCORE RESULTS									
Iowa Test of Basic Skills Reading	1/67	1	91	21.41	9.19	30	37	20	4
POST-TEST SCORE RESULTS									
Iowa Test of Basic Skills Reading	5/67	1	91	24.93	10.24	29	34	18	10

1/ Include here only students within the group, who continued through the project and were present to take both pre and post tests. The number of students who took the pre-test on this chart will be the same as the number who took the post-test.

2/ If not raw score, indicate type score reported for each test.

INSTRUCTIONS

Report data on the most widely used standardized tests in the project. Use this table separately for subtests and grade level. Report data from Achievement tests or achievement batteries only. Representative sampling for subtests and grades is encouraged.

t = 3.76

Significant at .01 level

90° of freedom .01 = 2.64
90° of freedom .05 = 1.99

Data for One Project - Maryland

TABLE 1 Part 1)

STANDARDIZED ACHIEVEMENT TEST RESULTS, TITLE I (ESEA) 1966-67
GROUPS TAKING PRE- AND POST-TESTS
(See instructions below)

Grade 5

Name of Test and Each Subsection	Month & Year Administered	Form	Number of Students 1/	Raw Score Mean 2/	Raw Score Std. Deviation 2/	Number of Students Scoring, According to National Norm: 25th Percentile And Below	26th To 50th Percentile	51st To 75th Percentile	75th Percentile And Above
PRE-TEST SCORE RESULTS									
Iowa Test of Basic Skills Reading	11/66	1	65	30.07	14.19	25	18	11	11
POST-TEST SCORE RESULTS	Month & Year Administered								
Iowa Test of Basic Skills Reading	5/67	1	65	35.61	17.80	28	13	12	12

1/ Include here only students within the group, who continued through the project and were present to take both pre and post tests. The number of students who took the pre-test on this chart will be the same as the number who took the post-test.

2/ If not raw score, indicate type score reported for each test.

INSTRUCTIONS

Report data on the most widely used standardized tests in the project. Use this table separately for subtests and grade level. Report data from Achievement tests or achievement batteries only. Representative sampling for subtests and grades is encouraged.

t = 3.76

Significant at .01 level

64° of freedom at .01 level = 2.66
64° of freedom at .05 level = 2.00

Data for One Project - Maryland

TABLE 7 (Part 1)

STANDARDIZED ACHIEVEMENT TEST RESULTS, TITLE I (ESEA) 1966-67
GROUPS TAKING PRE- AND POST-TESTS
(See instructions below)

Grade 6

Name of Test and Each Subsection	Month & Year Administered	Form	Number of Students 1/	Raw Score Mean 2/	Raw Score Std. Deviation 2/	Number of Students Scoring, According to National Norm: 25th Percentile And Below	26th To 50th Percentile	51st To 75th Percentile	75th Percentile And Above
PRE-TEST SCORE RESULTS									
Iowa Test of Basic Skills Reading	1/67	1	91	26.39	10.3	55	22	10	4
POST-TEST SCORE RESULTS									
	Month & Year Administered								
Iowa Test of Basic Skills Reading	5/67	1	91	29.91	11.65	47	29	10	5

1/ Include here only students within the group, who continued through the project and were present to take both pre and post tests. The number of students who took the pre-test on this chart will be the same as the number who took the post-test.

2/ If not raw score, indicate type score reported for each test.

INSTRUCTIONS

Report data on the most widely used standardized tests in the project. Use this table separately for subtests and grade level. Report data from Achievement tests or achievement batteries only. Representative sampling for subtests and grades is encouraged.

t = 4.13

Significant at .01 level

90° of freedom at .01 level = 2.64
90° of freedom at .05 level = 1.99

Data For One Project - Maryland

TABLE (Part 1)

Grade 7

STANDARDIZED ACHIEVEMENT TEST RESULTS, TITLE I (ESEA) 1966-67
GROUPS TAKING PRE- AND POST-TESTS
(See instructions below)

Name of Test and Each Subsection	Month & Year Administered	Form	Number of Students 1/	Raw Score Mean 2/	Raw Score Std. Deviation 2/	Number of Students Scoring, According to National Norm: 25th Percentile And Below	26th To 50th Percentile	51st To 75th Percentile	75th Percentile And Above
PRE-TEST SCORE RESULTS									
Iowa Test of Basic Skills Reading	11/66	1	51	21.06	6.24	37	13	1	0
POST-TEST SCORE RESULTS									
	Month & Year Administered								
Iowa Test of Basic Skills Reading	5/67	1	51	23.59	7.8	37	13	1	0

1/ Include here only students within the group, who continued through the project and were present to take both pre and post tests. The number of students who took the pre-test on this chart will be the same as the number who took the post-test.

2/ If not raw score, indicate type score reported for each test.

INSTRUCTIONS

Report data on the most widely used standardized tests in the project. Use this table separately for subtests and grade level. Report data from Achievement tests or achievement batteries only. Representative sampling for subtests and grades is encouraged.

t = 2.34

Significant at .05 level

50° of freedom at .01 level = 2.68
50° of freedom at .05 level = 2.01

Data for One Project - Maryland

TABLE ' (Part 1)

Grade 8

STANDARDIZED ACHIEVEMENT T T RESULTS, TITLE I (ESEA) 1966-67
GROUPS TAKING PRE- AND POST-TESTS
(See instructions below)

Name of Test and Each Subsection	Month & Year Administered	Form	Number of Students 1/	Raw Score Mean 2/	Raw Score Std. Deviation 2/	Number of Students Scoring, According to National Norm: 25th Percentile And Below	26th To 50th Percentile	51st To 75th Percentile	75th Percentile And Above
PRE-TEST SCORE RESULTS									
Iowa Test of Basic Skills Reading	1/67	1	13	25.15	7.80	9	3	1	0
POST-TEST SCORE RESULTS									
	Month & Year Administered								
Iowa Test of Basic Skills Reading	5/67	1	13	29.0	8.31	7	5	1	0

1/ Include here only students within the group, who continued through the project and were present to take both pre and post tests. The number of students who took the pre-test on this chart will be the same as the number who took the post-test.

2/ If not raw score, indicate type score reported for each test.

INSTRUCTIONS

Report data on the most widely used standardized tests in the project. Use this table separately for subtests and grade level. Report data from Achievement tests or achievement batteries only. Representative sampling for subtests and grades is encouraged.

t = 2.08

Approaching Significance

12° of freedom at .01 level = 3.06
12° of freedom at .05 level = 2.18

DATA FOR PROJECT "F"

TABLE 1 (Part 1)

STANDARDIZED ACHIEVEMENT TEST RESULTS, TITLE I (ESEA) 1966-67
GROUPS TAKING PRE- AND POST-TESTS
(See instructions below)

Grade 3

Name of Test and Each Subsection	Month & Year Administered	Form	Number of Students 1/	Raw Score Mean 2/ OGP	Raw Score Std. Deviation 2/ OGP	Number of Students Scoring, According to National Norm			
						25th percentile and below	26th to 50th percentile	51st to 75th percentile	75th percentile and above
PRE-TEST SCORE RESULTS									
Calif. Ach. Arithmetic	March 1966	W	243	3.8	+.1		63	138	42
	Month & Year Administered	POST-TEST SCORE RESULTS							
Calif. Ach. Arithmetic	April 1967	X	243	5.8	+.1		54	147	42

1/ Include here only students within the group, who continued through the project and were present to take both pre and post tests. The number of students who took the pre-test on this chart will be the same as the number who took the post-test.

2/ If not raw score, indicate type score reported for each test.

INSTRUCTIONS

Report data on the most widely used standardized tests in the project. Use this table separately for subtests and grade level. Report data from Achievement tests or achievement batteries only. Representative sampling for subtests and grades is encouraged.

TABLE 1 (Part 1)

STANDARDIZED ACHIEVEMENT TEST RESULTS, TITLE I (ESEA) 1966-67
GROUPS TAKING PRE- AND POST-TESTS
(See instructions below)

Grade 4

Name of Test and Each Subsection	Month & Year Administered	Form	Number of Students 1/	Raw Score Mean 2/	Raw Score Std. Deviation 2/	Number of Students Scoring, According to National Norm			
						25th percentile and below	26th to 50th percentile	51st to 75th percentile	75th percentile and above
PRE-TEST SCORE RESULTS									
Calif. Ach. Arithmetic	March 1966	W	212	5.3	+.7	16	92	80	24
	Month & Year Administered	POST-TEST SCORE RESULTS							
Calif. Ach. Arithmetic	April 1967	X	212	6.0	+.3	5	79	97	31

1/ Include here only students within the group, who continued through the project and were present to take both pre and post tests. The number of students who took the pre-test on this chart will be the same as the number who took the post-test.

2/ If not raw score, indicate type score reported for each test.

INSTRUCTIONS

Report data on the most widely used standardized tests in the project. Use this table separately for subtests and grade level. Report data from Achievement tests or achievement batteries only. Representative sampling for subtests and grades is encouraged.