DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 066 705 CS 000 114

AUTHOR Counelis, James Steve
TITLE The Hunters Point-Bayview SEED Project: A Diagnostic Review of Reading Achievement in the First Three Grades.
INSTITUTION San Francisco Univ., Calif.
PUB DATE Jun 72
NOTE 118p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS *Beginning Reading; Class Attendance; Class Size; *Disadvantaged Youth; Educational Improvement; *Elementary Grades; Negro Students; *Program Evaluation; *Reading Achievement; Sex Differences
IDENTIFIERS Hunters Point Bayview; *Project SEED; South East Educational Development Project

ABSTRACT

A diagnostic review of reading achievement in the first three grades of the South East Education Development (SEED) project is presented. Comparisons are made with the 1969-1970 SEED data, which is considered baseline. The findings indicated that: (1) no significant difference existed in the pooled attendance for each grade between two successive school years, (2) the reading programs moved children to progress at grade level, (3) reading rates tended toward normal development, (4) the 1970-1971 students in SEED earned significantly higher grades in reading on the whole than the 1969-1970 cohort of students in these grades, (5) the SEED children, as a whole, did not achieve reading scores at the national normed level, and (6) the stimulating use of educational funds collaterally spent by school community groups can work. Tables and appendices are included. (See also ED 052 905 for the first year report of the SEED project and CS 000 113.) (WR)

THE UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO

THE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION: EDUCATIONAL PLANNING LABORATORY

THE HUNTERS POINT-BAYVIEW SEED PROJECT: A DIAGNOSTIC REVIEW OF READING ACHIEVEMENT IN THE FIRST THREE GRADES

by

James Steve Counelis
Associate Professor of Education

San Francisco, California

June 26, 1972

THE UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO

School of Education

Dean:

Dr. Edward J. Griffin

Program Directors:

Sr. Mary Alma, P.B.V.M.
(Library Science)

Dr. Katherine V. Bishop
(Elementary Education)

Dr. John R. Devine
(Teacher Education)

Dr. Robert G. Lamp
(Administration)

Dr. Thomas D. McSweeney
(Counselor Education)

The Educational Planning Laboratory

Director:

Dr. Robert G. Lamp

Director of Research:

Dr. James Steve Counelis

THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Board of Education

President:

Dr. Zuretti L. Goosby

Vice President:

Dr. David J. Sanchez, Jr.

Members:

John F. Crowley

Dr. Laurel E. Glass

Mrs. Ernest R. Lilienthal

Howard N. Nemerovski

Allan H. Nichols

Superintendent:	Dr. Thomas A. Shaheen
Assistant Superintendent, Elementary Education:	Dr. Donald A. Rhodes
Assistant Superintendent, Instructional Development Services:	Dr. Raymond J. Pitts
Assistant Superintendent, Innovative Planning:	Isadore Pivnick
Director, Innovative Planning:	Victor Rossi
Acting Director of Research and Program Evaluation:	Yvon O. Johnson

THE SOUTH EAST EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT
170 Hilltop Road
San Francisco, California 94124

STAFF

School-Community Coordinator:

The Reverend Charles H. Lee

Supervisor for Education:

Robert L. Fisher

Supervisor for Community Relations:

Lonnie White

Secretarial Personnel:

Joan C. Knox
Alma Gray

Community Service Assistants:

Brazell Carter
William Davis
Mildred Derrick
Lana Ewing
Edward Grooms
Norma Johnson
Mary Lindsey
William Marquis
Eddie Morgan
Lionel Primus
Brenda Rainwater
Marvin Robinson
Carey Stowe
Lottie Taylor
Nathaniel Vaughn

SEED is a project under Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (Public Law 89-10), as amended by Public Law 90-247.

THE SEED BOARD

Chairman:

Essie Webb

Secretary:

Delores Williams

Parent Representatives:

+Cozetta Bruce
Tommie Jean Colbert
+Joleta Johnson
Erlinda Villa

Community Organization Representatives:

+Julia Commer
+Beatrice Dumbar
Bernice Howell
Ruby Markham
+Walter Simmons
Eloise Wilson

Principal-Teacher Members:

Virginia Cleveland
Bonnie Hammond
+Julia Irving
Susan Sanford

+Alternate

THE SEED PARENT REVIEW COMMITTEES

All Hallows:

Dorothea Franklin
+Alma Gray
Mary Hayes
Gloria Maffei
+Marlin Milligan
+Evelyn Nero
Erlinda Villa
=Delores Williams

Bayview:

Joyce Allen
Lena Baker
Yvonne Gooch
+Coreen Middleton
=George Turner
Lyndell Walridge

Bret Harte:

Iona Beech
+Gloria Daniels
Ollie Galbraith
James Lintz
Erma Stitt
Tessie Wilburn

Burnett:

Lola Belvin
Cozetta Bruce
+Betty Chaffin
+Katherine Mercer
=Thomas Parker
Doris Phillips
Inez Williams

Fremont:

Grace Britton
Annie Bowman
+Martha Daggs
+Dorothy Darden
Margaret James
Joleta Johnson
=Eva King

Hunters Point II:

Alice Barks
Thelma Crawford
+May Duty
+Nellie Marzett
Bessie Mosley
+Deloris Patton
+Jerline Penn
Aresa Senegal
+Helen Sterling
Norma Whitfield

Jedediah Smith:

Tommie Jean Colbert
George Earl
Eddie Jackson
Hazel Jones
=Willa Dean Jones

Sir Francis Drake:

=Ramona Graves
Selula Jobe
Paulene Ruth
Rosie Weullard
Mary Williams

=Chairman
+Alternate

THE SEED PROJECT SCHOOLS

All Hallows:

Sr. Marian Madden (Principal)
Sr. Cecile Bertheau
Sr. Melva Eckberg
Sr. Joyce Enyeart
Katherine Grimshaw
Lillian Lees
Sr. Ellen O'Leary
Elaine Susoeff

Bayview:

Leonia McQuillister (Principal)
Judy Chiolo
Joan Coates
Kathy Ginsburg
Virginia Johnson
Patricia O'Brien
Lynn Rankin
Helene Warwick
Sue Yee

Bret Harte:

Julita McLeod (Principal)
Jean Billubs
Mary Ann Burns
Dolores Galvan
Sandra Johnson
Bobbie Mitchell
Charlotte Ostergren
Margaret Robbins
Elixe Westmorland
Selena Williams
Jadene Yip
Geraldine Zannotti

Burnett:

Don E. Anderson (Principal)
Janet Bartky
Charlotte Conner
Lorna Sims Dorsey
Karen Ettinger
Mae Flethcher
Evelyn Forrester

Peggy McSweeney
Stephanie Pincson
Jeffrie Quinn
Elizabeth Schaefer
Lois Weinberg

Fremont:

Lucille B. Schmidt (Principal)
Faire Barry
Jean Kernisen
Grace Tani

Hunters Point II:

Alto C. Moorbrink (Principal)
[illegible]tte Durham
Sandra Fischbach
Juanita Johnson
Sara Samuel
Anna Wong

Jedediah Smith:

Martel Williams (Principal)
Elizabeth Cook
Julia Dixon
Bonnie Hammond
Janice Khalil
Dorinda Krivohlayek
Lonnie Lebin
Erma Medlock
Claudia Patasaw
Sandra Rudloff
Diana Thomason
Dorothy Williams

Sir Francis Drake:

Kelly Husbands (Principal)
Ethel Bruce
Betty Hudson
Virginia Miles
Kenneth McGrew
Mary Louise Nichols
Lida Opalenik
Alice Rappaport
Susan Sanford
Toni Sinegal
Patricia Wilcox
Deanne Yee

PREFACE

The first two SEED reports dealt with reading in the schools of Hunters Point-Bayview during the academic year 1969-1970. During that year, only the first grade students were afforded SEED funded project services and materials.

This report, concerned with the 1970-1971 academic year, presents a diagnostic review of reading achievement in the first three grades. The 1969-1970 data is considered baseline; and hence some comparisons are presented.

The preface of the first report noted the following:

> There is much to admire in the SEED project's efforts and educational progress in first grade reading education as the reader will see for himself further in this diagnostic review. However, the work of this diagnostic reviewer was hampered by recent policies of the Unified School District of San Francisco in relation to the use of ability or so called I.Q. tests in the evaluational work of programs. Explicitly, Mr. Yvon O. Johnson's memorandum of May 11, 1970 is the current embodiment of that policy. The complete text of this memorandum is found in Appendix I. Its essence is the prohibition of ability tests for program evaluation purposes. Though there are many reasons why this policy came into being and effect, the accounting for variance in achievement test results is not possible without external criterion measures of a standardized variety. This writer believes that this policy is too stringent in character. He also believes that this was not the original intent of the board policy, viz., to hamper educational evaluation of programs. Allowance for ability tests in program evaluations is not only appropriate but needed. Ignorance is no substitute for science; and the argument from silence is no argument at all.

In this report the same words obtain and the text of Mr. Johnson's memorandum is found in the Appendix.

As in the two previous reports, I am pleased to make my gratitude known to the Reverend Charles H. Lee, SEED project director, and the entire SEED staff for their aid which not only was cooperative but unstinting in support. To Mr. Robert L. Fisher, SEED supervisor in education, I am grateful for his sharing of knowledge, experience and pragmatic insights with elementary education in the urban ghetto called Hunters Point-Bayview. I am also grateful for his review of findings in this report so as to check incongruities and errors that might have crept into it inadvertently.

To my graduate student and research assistant Mr. Gregory D. Nelson, I am grateful for his aid in preparing the statistical details of this report. I note with particular pleasure the computer programming work of Mr. Alvin S. Begun, graduate student in chemistry in the University of San Francisco Department of Chemistry and Institute of Chemical Biology. He did conscientious and able work to which the quality of this report is indebted. Also, I am most appreciative of the able services of Miss Diane Pederson, whose typing skills made this manuscript a reality.

To Dr. Robert G. Lamp, Director of the Educational Planning Laboratory and my colleague and friend in the new School of Education of the University of San Francisco, I owe much. I am appreciative for the opportunity to learn from this service to urban education; and the quality of that experience is a gift for which I am grateful.

To my patient and loving family, Anna, Steven and George, my affection is boundless for their understanding.

The results of this project report rest with me and the responsibility for it is mine in its entirety.

JSC

June 26, 1972
The University of San Francisco
San Francisco, California 94117

A LIST OF MAJOR FINDINGS

The findings presented below are the results of this report in abbreviated form. The results are on the reading achievement of students in the first three grades of the eight SEED schools in San Francisco's Hunters Point-Bayview area. The baseline data are from the 1969-1970 project year of SEED in these same schools. Of course, these findings are subject to the usual qualifications which arise from the variability found at the levels of the schools, the classroom, the individual students and their numbers.

For the eight SEED project schools in the Hunters Point-Bayview area, the following 1970-1971 findings have been established:

1. On the average, the first grade students attended about 82 percent of the school year; the second grade students attended about 88 percent of the school year; and the third grade students attended about 90 percent of the school year.

2. On the whole, the attendance patterns in 1970-1971 did not differ in a statistically significant sense from the baseline year of 1969-1970.

3. The mean stanine score of the first grade students was 4.42 which is approaching mid-range in the "At Grade Level" category, that score being substantially above

the 1969-1970 first grade students' mean stanine score of 3.52.

4. The mean stanine score of the second grade students was 4.00 which is at the first level of the "At Grade Level" category, that score being substantially above the 1969-1970 second grade students' mean stanine score of 2.69.

5. The mean stanine score of the third grade students was 2.58 which is in the upper third range of the "Below Grade Level" category, that score being barely above the 1969-1970 third grade students' mean stanine score of 2.49.

6. The mean grade equivalent score achieved by the first grade students was 1.76 which (when compared with the normed expected grade level of 1.90) was estimated to be about one school month below grade level.

7. The mean grade equivalent score achieved by second grade students was 2.36 which (when compared with the normed expected grade level of 2.90) was estimated to be about 5 school months below grade level.

8. The mean grade equivalent score achieved by the third grade students was 2.63 which (when compared with the normed expected grade level of 3.90) was estimated to be approximately 13 school months below grade level.

9. The reading growth rate of the first grade students was estimated to be 1.17, or about 17 percent above the normal rate of 1.00, that is, one school month's reading achievement per each school month of instruction.

10. The reading growth rate of the second grade students was estimated to be 1.22, or about 22 percent above the normal rate of 1.00, that is, one school month's reading achievement per each school month of instruction.

11. The reading growth rate of the third grade students was estimated to be .82 or about 18 percent below the normal rate of 1.00, that is, one month's reading achievement per each month of instruction.

12. For all schools and grades on the whole, boys and girls did not differ in a statistical sense in terms of school attendance.

13. For all grades on the whole, the girls generally earned higher grade equivalent scores in reading than did

the boys; and on a pooled basis, the first and third grade girls earned statistically significant higher grade equivalent scores in reading than did the boys.

14. For all schools and grades, the 1970-1971 cohort of students earned significantly higher grade equivalent scores in reading than did the previous 1969-1970 cohort of students in the same SEED schools.

INTRODUCTION

Two reports have been written evaluating the first full year of SEED project work during the academic year of 1969-1970.[1] This third report covers the work of the first three grades under the SEED project for the academic year of 1970-1971. The SEED data became available late October 1971. The material work culminating in this report was completed by March 1972.

Like the two previous reports, this is a post hoc description. The consultants were able to get pre-test and post-test data on the second and third grade students. Data were collected on the relation between instructional time and achievement, but the labor on that aspect must be left to another report. As a post hoc report with no prior control over design beyond the implementing of pre-testing for the second and third graders in reading, much must be left unsaid because to assert more than data warrant is merely to assert arguments from silence.

The SEED project schools are eight in number: The seven public schools are: (1) Bayview; (2) Bret Harte;

(3) Burnett; (4) Fremont; (5) Hunters Point II; (6) Jedidiah Smith; (7) Sir Francis Drake. All Hallows, a Roman Catholic school, was the eighth institution.

This report provides a descriptive analysis of 1,617 students in three grades which is 95 percent of the 1,706 students in the program. For details on number of students in study, see Tables Nos. 1-4 which provide data on a school and sex basis.

---

[1]These reports are: (1) James Steve Counelis, First Grade Students in the Hunters Point-Bayview SEED Project: A Diagnostic Review (San Francisco: University of San Francisco, Educational Planning Laboratory, August 15, 1970); (2) James Steve Counelis, Second and Third Grade Students in the Hunters Point-Bayview SEED Project: A Diagnostic Review (San Francisco: University of San Francisco, Educational Planning Laboratory, October 26, 1971).

THE EMPIRICAL BASIS FOR THIS DIAGNOSTIC REVIEW

Through the cooperation of the education professionals in the schools and SEED Office, a set of empirical measures were collected on students in the first three grades. These student data were: (1) student's name; (2) student's birthdate: month and year; (3) student's sex; (4) the number of full days in program attendance/student; (5) student's grade; (6) student's teacher; (7) student's school; (8) pre-test reading scores/student: GES and stanine for the second and third grades only; (9) post-test reading scores/student: GES and stanine for all three grades. Though there was a third grade mathematics test, only reading is being considered in this report.

Every evaluator expects to find partial records. As noted before, partial and full records are available on 1,617 students out of 1,706 students present in the SEED program's first three grades. This is a 95 percent return. However the degree of partial records must be described in other terms. Table No. 5 provides data. On the variables of birthdate, attendance, sex, and pre and post scores, Table No. 5

indicates variability of percent return. With the exception of first graders' birthdays and sex, all other variables vary from 61 percent to 82 percent. Though a higher percentage return would be desirable, the percent of partial records for these variables is not insignificant on a pooled basis. Tables Nos. 6-8 provide the school and class sources for the missing data. It must be noted that no reading pre-test for first graders is available and hence no data is expected in these cells.

The reading tests used in this project were those selected by the San Francisco Unified School District. These were:

(1) Grade One: Post-test only -- Stanford Achievement Test: Primary I for Grades 1 -- Reading, Form W;

(2) Grade Two: Pre-test and Post-test -- Stanford Achievement Test: Primary II for Middle of Grade 2 to end of Grade 3, Form W;

(3) Grade Three: Pre-test and Post-test -- Stanford Achievement Test: Primary II, for Middle of Grade 2 to end of Grade 3, Form X.

The pre-tests were given in late October 1970 and the post-tests were given in late May 1971. Both grade equivalent scores (GES) and stanine scores were recorded for use in this study.

As indicated in the previous diagnostic review studies, no attempt will be made to assess the effectiveness

of the several curricular approaches to reading which the several facilities opted to use. These evaluational problems are not amenable to post hoc educational analysis. Though these complex problems are amenable to systematic inquiry, this was not attempted here. Hence, the second full year of educational experimentation in curriculum cannot be described or evaluated. Only gross educational growth numbers can be calculated.

NON-ACADEMIC CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SEED PROJECT STUDENTS

The racial/ethnic composition of the SEED project schools typified the neighborhood housing patterns in San Francisco's industrial slum, Bayview-Hunters Point prior to court order integration of these elementary schools. In the official estimates of the San Francisco Unified School District, blacks constituted the largest group, 92 percent (92.3%). Spanish surnamed students constituted almost 3 percent (2.6%) and Orientals made up another 2 percent (2.0%). It appears that Sir Francis Drake was almost completely black (97.0%), and Fremont had almost 9 percent Spanish surnames (8.5%), and Bayview had almost 7 percent (6.6%) Oriental. Table No. 9 records these official data.

Tables Nos.10-12 provide the sex distribution for all schools at each grade level. On the whole, each of the three grades has roughly a sex distribution of 52 percent boys and 48 percent girls. The particular schools vary by grade level and their data are seen in these tables.

The mean ages of these students seem quite in line

with the expectation. The mean age of boys and girls in the first grade was 7.14 years. The mean age of boys and girls in the second grade was 8.20 years. The mean age of the third grade boys and girls was 9.12 years. See Tables Nos. 13-15 for datal details.

ATTENDANCE PATTERNS

School attendance is an empirical indicator of the child's availability for his or her opportunity in instruction. Of course, the lower the attendance records, the lower the opportunity to learn.

But attendance in lower schools is also an empirical indicator of the degree of rapport, cordiality, and cooperation between the parents and the schools. The reasoning is, the closer the cooperation between parent and school, the higher the attendance of the child, and thus, the greater the opportunity for the child to learn.

Comparative mean attendance figures are available for the three grades for academic 1970-1971 and 1969-1970. These are presented below in this order:

(1) First Grade: 146.09 days/151.83 days;

(2) Second Grade: 157.16 days/157.27 days;

(3) Third Grade: 160.45 days/160.19 days.

Two academic years in the row provide mean attendance figures in the same neighborhood. Tables Nos. 16-18 contain these

comparative data by school and academic year.

Another way to look at attendance is in terms of mean percent attendance. Tables Nos. 19-21 provide the following for 1970-1971:

(1) First Grade: 81.62 mean percent of days in attendance;

(2) Second Grade: 87.80 mean percent of days in attendance;

(3) Third Grade: 89.64 mean percent of days in attendance.

These statistics, plus the data on specific schools, indicate a good level of attendance, although childhood susceptibility to disease is known to be high for these age/grade students.

Tables Nos. 22-27 provide two statistical tests as to whether there was any statistically significant difference on the attendance in the same schools and grade levels between 1970-1971 and 1969-1970 academic years. Tables Nos. 22-24 record the Kruskal-Wallis One Way Analysis of Variance Test by Ranks, H, for each of the first three grades. In each grade, there was no statistically significant difference found in the mean attendance of the several schools taken collectively. Tables Nos. 25-27 present the record of the Wilcoxon Matched Pairs Signed Ranks Test for the first three grades. This test statistic measures whether the matched schools' mean attendance was significantly different. Here

an expected statistical significance was found to exist for all three grades when the attendance of the two successive school years for each school is compared. Consult the Tables Nos. 25-27 for the direction of those differences.

Thus two sets of facts emerge: (1) the attendance for all three grades was above 80 percent for all schools pooled; (2) there was no statistically significant difference in the pooled attendance for each grade between two successive school years, 1969-1970 and 1970-1971, though differences for each school and grade did exist on a paired basis.

READING ACHIEVEMENT

In May 1970, the first three grades in the SEED schools were given the Stanford reading achievement tests. The specific forms given each grade were noted above. Tables Nos. 28-30 provide overall and specific school results in terms of mean grade equivalent scores (GES).

The grade equivalent score (GES) represents the level of competence and achievement anticipated, such anticipation based upon normed populations. The grade equivalent score (GES) is designated on a ten month academic year. It is a decimal number, like 6.3. The whole number "6" represents the sixth grade; the decimal number ".3" represents the achievement of a student completing the third month of instruction in a given subject matter during the ten month academic year in the sixth grade.

For the first three grades, it was hoped that each student would achieve the GES equivalent to his grade and month of instruction. Below are given the actual mean grade equivalent scores and their anticipated levels of achievement.

(1) First Grade: Achieved Mean GES - 1.76;
Estimated Mean GES - 1.90;

(2) Second Grade: Achieved Mean GES - 2.36;
Estimated Mean GES - 2.90;

(3) Third Grade: Achieved Mean GES - 2.63;
Estimated Mean GES - 3.90.

As a group, it is quite apparent that these students lag behind the estimated norm. Only the first grade students at the Bret Harte School (Mean GES = 1.99) and the Burnett School (Mean GES = 2.14) were within the "normed" ballpark. For all SEED schools, see Tables Nos. 28-30.

Another way to look at these test results is through the stanine score. This score is defined as follows:

(1) Above Grade Level: 7, 8, 9;

(2) At Grade Level: 4, 5, 6;

(3) Below Grade Level: 1, 2, 3.

Given a particular subject and its grade level defined, achievement tests are scored with stanine scores to see whether the students are achieving within very broadly defined categories for each grade level. The mean stanine scores per grade level for 1970-1971 and 1969-1970, respectively are:

(1) First Grade: 4.42/3.52;

(2) Second Grade: 4.00/2.69;

(3) Third Grade: 2.58/2.49.

It appears that the first and second grades are working at grade level; but the third grade students are below level. See Tables Nos. 31-33 for data.

In comparing the stanine scores of the 1970-1971 students to these students in 1969-1970, some interesting findings are to be found but these must be related to the SEED program's timing.

Instruction under the SEED program's funding commenced in October 1969. Using the 1969-1970 mean stanine scores as baselines, the first grade children in 1970-1971 earned a mean stanine score that is .90 above the 1969-1970 first graders, or nearly 1 stanine score improvement. The 1970-1971 second graders, who were in SEED program instruction as first graders in 1969-1970, earned an increase of 1.31 stanine points over 1969-1970 second graders who were first graders taught in the standard reading curriculum of the San Francisco Unified School District. The third grade students of 1970-1971, who had been in tuition under the standard reading curriculum of the San Francisco Unified School District for their first two years, had a very poor improvement and remained in the "Below Grade Level" category. It appears that the SEED project reading programs moved children to progress at grade level, though they all began at different levels of reading readiness.

READING GROWTH RATE

There are two statistical approaches taken here to determine and validate reading growth. Both approaches involve the pooled comparison of pre-test and post-test data. No pre-testing for reading readiness was done on the first grade children.

At the end of October 1970, the pre-testing of reading achievement levels for the second and third graders occurred. The post-test time for the San Francisco Unified School District was mid-May 1971. These data were collected by the SEED staff from faculty and they are the basis of this finding.

For both the second and third grade students, a Kruskal-Wallis One Way Analysis of Variance H statistic was calculated. Tables Nos. 34-35 record the fact that as groups, the second and third grade students' reading improved between October 1970 and May 1971. These findings were statistically significant at the one percent level.

The second approach is simpler. It is to calculate the monthly reading achievement rate (R) as follows:

$$R = (T_2 - T_1)/6.5.$$

T_2 represents the mean GES for the post-test in reading; and T_1 represents the mean GES for the pre-test in reading. The 6.5 represents the number of months of instruction between T_2 and T_1, viz., the pre-test given at the end of October 1970 and the post-test given in the third week of May 1971. Tables Nos. 36-38 provide the data and generated statistical differences.

In calculating the monthly achievement rate (R) for the first grade pupils, it was assumed that all or most of the first graders entered with a normal level of reading readiness. This assumption is not empirical because no reading readiness pre-test was given the first graders in October 1970. The positing of this assumption is done in the interest of pragmatics and candor; and this assumption is a severe limitation on the data generated on first grade reading achievement and reading achievement rates. I do not believe that even a majority of the students entering the first grade in the Bayview-Hunters Point school come with first grade reading readiness. That is also the experience of the teachers in these schools. Hence, the convenience and convention of accepting the assumption reservedly is indulged in at this

point.

Tables Nos. 36-38 record the reading achievement rates for each grade, by sex and school. Table No. 36 records the data on first graders. Keeping our reservation in mind, Fremont, Jedidiah Smith, and Sir Francis Drake first grade students were below the normal reading achievement rate, R, of 1.00. On the whole, the pooled first graders progressed normally at one month's reading achievement for each month's instruction. In fact, the Burnett girls progressed twice the normal rate, and the Burnett boys progressed at one and one-half times the normal rate.

The second grade students on the whole progressed at an R = 1.22, or about 22 percent faster than normal. With the anomalous exception of the Hunters Point II children, this rate of achievement is excellent. We are reminded that these children are in the second year of specially funded SEED reading programs.

The third grade students' reading achievement rate was below the normal expected, viz., R = 1.00. On a pooled base for all SEED schools, the reading achievement rate (R) was found to be .82. These third graders were exposed to the standard curriculum of the San Francisco Unified School District for their first two years. The SEED project resources went into the second and third grade levels for the first

time during 1970-1971. Hence the below average reading achievements reflect the cummulative effect of the standard curriculum. Only All Hallows, Jedidiah Smith, and the children at Hunters Point II reflected on a pooled basis anything in normal range of growth.

The facts on reading achievement rates indicate that reading rates under SEED project programs tended toward normal development. What appears to be the fact is that the students, individually, start reading at different levels of readiness. Also, there is little knowledge as to the "rhythm" of learning reading. I suspect the rates measured between the pre-test in late October 1970 and mid-May 1971 were those averaged out on the middle to upper slope of the standard learning curve.

TWO COMPARISONS

Two types of comparisons are to be set forth in this section. These are: (1) sex-linked differences in school attendance and grade equivalent score in reading; (2) a Kruskal-Wallis One Way Analysis of Variance H statistic comparison of 1969-1970 and 1970-1971 students' mean grade equivalent scores.

Tables Nos. 39-41 contain the Mann-Whitney U test statistics on whether SEED boys and girls differed significantly as to mean attendance. As found in the previous SEED reports, the boys and girls did not differ on the attendance variable by grade or school. A one percent level criterion was used.

Tables Nos. 42-44 contain the Mann-Whitney U test statistics on whether SEED boys and girls differed significantly as to mean GES's. Only the first grade girls at Burnett School and third grade girls at the Fremont School were found to have significantly higher grade equivalent scores. Tables Nos. 31-33 note that girls exceeded the boys' mean grade equivalent scores on a pooled basis. However, on

a pooled basis, the Mann-Whitney U statistic cited only the first and third grade girls being significantly higher in grade equivalent scores than boys. This was held at the one percent level. See Tables Nos. 42-44 for specific data. This finding tends to support previous research in this area.

The second type of comparison being made here through the Kruskal-Wallis One Way Analysis of Variance H statistic is: Is there a significant difference in the per-school mean grade equivalent scores in reading earned by the 1969-1970 cohort of students in the SEED program and the 1970-1971 cohort of students in the SEED program? Tables Nos. 45-47 present the statistical result of that question. The answer is that for all three grades, the 1970-1971 students in SEED earned significantly higher grade equivalent scores in reading on the whole than the 1969-1970 cohort of students in these grades. These findings were significant at the one percent level.

OVERVIEW OF SEED'S TWO YEARS OF WORK

In this summary note, the following can be asserted about the SEED project's stewardship in Hunters Point-Bayview:

(1) On the whole, the SEED children did not achieve reading scores at the national normed levels.

(2) On the whole, the reading achievement rates were normal, though the beginning levels of readiness (not tested) are probably low. This probably accounts for lower reading scores than the national norms.

(3) The 1970-1971 cohort of children in the SEED on a pooled school basis achieved higher reading scores than the 1969-1970 cohort of children, this being true for each of the three grades.

These three facts of the SEED project's program in the San Francisco Unified School District schools (including one Roman Catholic school) are encouraging. The normal and above normal rates of achievement and the higher reading achievement of the second cohort of children in the SEED schools are happy facts. There is no doubt that the character of these reading programs under SEED needsto be detailed and examined to learn from them. But more importantly, the obvious need of earlier educational intervention in the lives of ghettoized children is a necessity. Early childhood edu-

cation centers at the pre-nursery, nursery and kindergarten levels, along with parental education programs, are needed now. The learning lives of these children need stimulating beginnings in order to grow to their natural potentials.

The stewardship of the SEED project's school-community structure has made a significant contribution to the notion that close school-community relations can aid to produce better education. And the stimulating use of educating funds collaterally spent by school-community groups can work, given the goodwill to do so.

APPENDIX

SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
Division of Research and Program Evaluation

May 11, 1970

MEMORANDUM

To: All Evaluators of Special Programs

From: Yvon O. Johnson, Acting Director
Research and Program Evaluation

Subject: Use of Ability (IQ) Tests in Program Evaluation

Inasmuch as the primary intent of all special instructional programs presently carried on in the San Francisco Unified School District is to increase student achievement in subject-matter content and skills;

And, inasmuch as the employment, if any, of ability (IQ) tests is only to attempt to describe the learning ability of the participating students and is not an integral part of the evaluation of student achievement;

And, inasmuch as there exists concern as to the validity of present ability (IQ) tests in measuring the learning potential of ethnic minority and/or low-socioeconomic-status students, and that there is a concern that a self-fulfilling prophecy can result when program personnel use these ability (IQ) scores as an indication of student learning potential;

Therefore, the Division of Research and Program Evaluation hereby directs all inhouse and contract evaluators of special programs that, as of this date, the following statements apply to all present and future special instructional programs:

1. No ability (IQ) tests other than those mandated by the State of California are to be administered to program students.

2. No ability (IQ) test scores, including those obtained from State-mandated testing, are to be maintained in the special program's data bank or records. Existing IQ scores in the program's data bank or records are to be removed or blanked out.

3. Program evaluators will not furnish ability (IQ) scores to program personnel or others.

4. Program evaluation reports will not contain ability (IQ) scores.

This directive does not preclude any studies or experiments that attempt to develop culture-free or culturally relevant tests of learning ability, proficiency, or potential. Permission for such studies must, of course, be obtained through this office.

YOJ:eh

TABLE NO. 1: EXTENT OF PARTIAL RECORDS FOR ALL SEED SCHOOLS AND ALL GRADES, BY SEX, 1970-1971

ALL SCHOOLS	TOTAL STUDENTS IN PROJECT		TOTAL STUDENTS IN STUDY		TOTAL STUDENTS WITHOUT DATA	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
FIRST GRADE						
Boys	302	100	265	88	37	12
Girls	265	100	242	91	23	9
Boys and Girls	567	100	507	89	60	11
SECOND GRADE						
Boys	279	100	266	95	13	5
Girls	258	100	251	97	7	3
Boys and Girls	537	100	517	96	20	4
THIRD GRADE						
Boys	312	100	306	98	6	2
Girls	290	100	287	99	3	1
Boys and Girls	602	100	593	98	9	2

TABLE NO. 2: EXTENT OF PARTIAL RECORDS ON SEED PROJECT FIRST GRADE STUDENTS, 1970-1971

SCHOOLS	TOTAL STUDENTS IN PROJECT		TOTAL STUDENTS IN STUDY		TOTAL STUDENTS WITHOUT DATA	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
ALL SCHOOLS						
Boys	302	100	265	88	37	12
Girls	265	100	242	91	23	9
Boys and Girls	567	100	507	89	60	11
ALL HALLOWS						
Boys	28	100	21	75	7	25
Girls	30	100	27	90	3	10
Boys and Girls	58	100	48	89	10	11
BAYVIEW						
Boys	48	100	42	87	6	13
Girls	24	100	24	100	0	0
Boys and Girls	72	100	66	91	6	9
BRET HARTE						
Boys	49	100	40	82	9	18
Girls	57	100	47	82	10	18
Boys and Girls	106	100	87	82	19	18

TABLE NO. 2: CONTINUED

SCHOOLS	TOTAL STUDENTS IN PROJECT		TOTAL STUDENTS IN STUDY		TOTAL STUDENTS WITHOUT DATA	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
BURNETT						
Boys	60	100	49	82	11	18
Girls	53	100	48	91	5	9
Boys and Girls	113	100	97	86	16	14
FREMONT						
Boys	11	100	11	100	--	--
Girls	13	100	12	92	1	8
Boys and Girls	24	100	23	96	1	4
HUNTERS POINT II						
Boys	10	100	10	100	--	--
Girls	8	100	7	99	1	1
Boys and Girls	18	100	17	99	1	1
JEDEDIAH SMITH						
Boys	47	100	47	100	--	--
Girls	42	100	42	100	--	--
Boys and Girls	89	100	89	100	--	--

TABLE NO. 2: CONTINUED

SCHOOLS	TOTAL STUDENTS IN PROJECT		TOTAL STUDENTS IN STUDY		TOTAL STUDENTS WITHOUT DATA	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
SIR FRANCIS DRAKE						
Boys	49	100	45	91	4	9
Girls	38	100	35	92	3	8
Boys and Girls	87	100	80	91	7	9

TABLE NO. 3: EXTENT OF PARTIAL RECORDS ON SEED PROJECT SECOND GRADE STUDENTS, 1970-1971

SCHOOLS	TOTAL STUDENTS IN PROJECT		TOTAL STUDENTS IN STUDY		TOTAL STUDENTS WITHOUT DATA	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
ALL SCHOOLS						
Boys	279	100	266	95	13	5
Girls	258	100	251	97	7	3
Boys and Girls	537	100	517	96	20	4
ALL HALLOWS						
Boys	27	100	26	96	1	4
Girls	33	100	33	100	--	--
Boys and Girls	60	100	59	98	1	2
BAYVIEW						
Boys	27	100	26	96	1	4
Girls	30	100	29	97	1	3
Boys and Girls	57	100	55	96	2	4
BRET HARTE						
Boys	46	51	43	94	3	6
Girls	44	49	42	95	2	5
Boys and Girls	90	100	85	95	5	5

TABLE NO. 3: CONTINUED

SCHOOLS	TOTAL STUDENTS IN PROJECT		TOTAL STUDENTS IN STUDY		TOTAL STUDENTS WITHOUT DATA	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
BURNETT						
Boys	52	63	52	100	--	--
Girls	30	37	30	100	--	--
Boys and Girls	82	100	82	100	--	--
FREMONT						
Boys	23	52	23	100	--	--
Girls	21	48	20	95	1	5
Boys and Girls	44	100	43	98	1	2
HUNTERS POINT II						
Boys	25	100	17	68	8	32
Girls	17	100	14	82	3	18
Boys and Girls	42	100	31	74	11	26
JEDEDIAH SMITH						
Boys	42	100	42	100	--	--
Girls	41	100	41	100	--	--
Boys and Girls	83	100	83	100	--	--

TABLE NO. 3: CONTINUED

SCHOOLS	TOTAL STUDENTS IN PROJECT		TOTAL STUDENTS IN STUDY		TOTAL STUDENTS WITHOUT DATA	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
SIR FRANCIS DRAKE						
Boys	37	100	37	100	--	--
Girls	42	100	42	100	--	--
Boys and Girls	79	100	79	100	--	--

TABLE NO. 4: EXTENT OF PARTIAL RECORDS ON SEED PROJECT THIRD GRADE STUDENTS, 1970-1971

SCHOOLS	TOTAL STUDENTS IN PROJECT		TOTAL STUDENTS IN STUDY		TOTAL STUDENTS WITHOUT DATA	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
ALL SCHOOLS						
Boys	312	100	306	98	6	2
Girls	290	100	287	99	3	1
Boys and Girls	602	100	593	98	9	2
ALL HALLOWS						
Boys	37	100	37	100	--	--
Girls	46	100	46	100	--	--
Boys and Girls	83	100	83	100	--	--
BAYVIEW						
Boys	41	100	38	93	3	7
Girls	36	100	36	100	--	--
Boys and Girls	77	100	74	96	3	4
BRET HARTE						
Boys	51	100	51	100	--	--
Girls	43	100	43	100	--	--
Boys and Girls	94	100	94	100	--	--

TABLE NO. 4: CONTINUED

SCHOOLS	TOTAL STUDENTS IN PROJECT		TOTAL STUDENTS IN STUDY		TOTAL STUDENTS WITHOUT DATA	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
BURNETT						
Boys	32	100	32	100	--	--
Girls	48	100	48	100	--	--
Boys and Girls	80	100	80	100	--	--
FREMONT						
Boys	41	100	39	95	2	5
Girls	29	100	28	97	1	3
Boys and Girls	70	100	67	96	3	4
HUNTERS POINT II						
Boys	18	100	17	94	1	6
Girls	17	100	16	94	1	6
Boys and Girls	35	100	33	94	2	6
JEDEDIAH SMITH						
Boys	44	100	44	100	--	--
Girls	30	100	30	100	--	--
Boys and Girls	74	100	74	100	--	--

TABLE NO. 4: CONTINUED

SCHOOLS	TOTAL STUDENTS IN PROJECT		TOTAL STUDENTS IN STUDY		TOTAL STUDENTS WITHOUT DATA	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
SIR FRANCIS DRAKE						
Boys	48	100	48	100	--	--
Girls	41	100	40	98	1	2
Boys and Girls	89	100	88	98	1	2

TABLE NO. 5: FREQUENCY AND PROPORTIONAL DISTRIBUTION OF SEED STUDENT RECORDS FOR ALL SCHOOLS AND GRADES, PER VARIABLE

SCHOOL, TEACHER, AND CLASS SIZE	BIRTH DATE	NUMBER OF FULL DAYS	SEX	PRE-TEST		POST-TEST	
				GES	STANINE	GES	STANINE
ALL SCHOOLS							
Grade 1: 567	254	345	567	---	---	460	460
(100%)	(45)	(61)	(100)	---	---	(81)	(81)
Grade 2: 537	346	376	537	304	382	441	440
(100%)	(64)	(70)	(100)	(72)	(71)	(82)	(82)
Grade 3: 602	465	415	602	517	516	460	460
(100%)	(77)	(69)	(100)	(86)	(86)	(76)	(76)

TABLE NO. 6: FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF SEED FIRST GRADE STUDENT RECORDS BY SCHOOL AND VARIABLES

SCHOOL, TEACHER, AND CLASS SIZE	BIRTH DATE	NUMBER OF FULL DAYS	SEX	PRE-TEST		POST-TEST	
				GES	STANINE	GES	STANINE
ALL HALLOWS							
(1) 30	--	28	30	--	--	29	29
(2) 28	--	--	28	--	--	19	19
BAYVIEW							
(1) 27	--	21	27	--	--	20	20
(2) 22	--	--	22	--	--	21	21
(3) 23	--	23	23	--	--	21	21
BRET HARTE							
(1) 27	17	--	27	--	--	20	20
(2) 27	16	16	27	--	--	23	23
(3) 27	20	24	27	--	--	24	24
(4) 25	--	--	25	--	--	13	13
BURNETT							
(1) 26	18	--	26	--	--	20	20
(2) 15	9	15	15	--	--	10	10
(3) 30	14	20	30	--	--	23	23
(4) 25	12	2	25	--	--	[illegible]	[illegible]

TABLE NO. 6: CONTINUED

SCHOOL, TEACHER, AND CLASS SIZE	BIRTH DATE	NUMBER OF FULL DAYS	SEX	PRE-TEST		POST-TEST	
				GES	STANINE	GES	STANINE
FREMONT							
(1) 24	15	18	24	--	--	20	20
HUNTERS POINT II							
(1) 18	11	--	18	--	--	16	16
JEDEDIAH SMITH							
(1) 23	23	23	23	--	--	23	23
(2) 22	22	22	22	--	--	21	21
(3) 22	22	22	22	--	--	18	18
(4) 22	19	21	22	--	--	19	19
SIR FRANCIS DRAKE							
(1) 3	--	3	3	--	--	2	2
(2) 13	4	12	13	--	--	12	12
(3) 25	5	22	25	--	--	22	22
(4) 20	9	17	20	--	--	18	18
(5) 26	9	22	26	--	--	21	21

TABLE NO. 7: FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF SEED SECOND GRADE STUDENT RECORDS BY SCHOOL AND VARIABLES

SCHOOL, TEACHER AND CLASS SIZE	BIRTH DATE	NUMBER OF FULL DAYS	SEX	PRE-TEST		POST-TEST	
				GES	STANINE	GES	STANINE
ALL HALLOWS							
(1) 32	24	30	32	28	28	26	26
(2) 28	24	26	28	26	26	21	21
BAYVIEW							
(1) 29	--	27	29	23	23	26	26
(2) 28	--	24	28	22	22	25	25
BRET HARTE							
(1) 26	25	--	26	25	25	24	24
(2) 28	--	--	28	--	--	21	21
(3) 11	11	10	11	--	--	8	8
(4) 25	3	22	25	--	--	24	24
BURNETT							
(1) 28	25	22	28	25	25	23	23
(2) 28	26	24	28	25	25	23	23
(3) 26	25	20	26	25	25	19	19

TABLE NO. 7: CONTINUED

SCHOOL, TEACHER, AND CLASS SIZE	BIRTH DATE	NUMBER OF FULL DAYS	SEX	PRE-TEST		POST-TEST	
				GES	STANINE	GES	STANINE
FREMONT							
(1) 28	20	23	28	12	10	22	21
(2) 16	13	13	16	--	--	13	13
HUNTERS POINT II							
(1) 26	16	8	26	17	17	9	9
(2) 16	--	5	16	6	6	7	7
JEDEDIAH SMITH							
(1) 22	21	21	22	19	19	21	21
(2) 24	24	23	24	22	22	21	21
(3) 25	25	25	25	23	23	25	25
(4) 12	12	--	12	11	11	11	11
SIR FRANCIS DRAKE							
(1) 11	1	11	11	10	10	11	11
(2) 22	10	20	22	20	20	20	20
(3) 24	21	--	24	23	23	20	20
(4) 22	20	22	22	22	22	21	21

TABLE NO. 8: FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF SEED THIRD GRADE STUDENT RECORDS BY SCHOOL AND VARIABLES

SCHOOL, TEACHER, AND CLASS SIZE	BIRTH DATE	NUMBER OF FULL DAYS	SEX	PRE-TEST		POST-TEST	
				GES	STANINE	GES	STANINE
ALL HALLOWS							
(1) 56	45	34	56	44	44	32	32
(2) 27	20	11	27	21	21	--	--
BAYVIEW							
(1) 25	22	24	25	21	21	22	22
(2) 28	14	22	28	18	18	23	23
(3) 24	17	20	24	19	19	17	17
BRET HARTE							
(1) 25	25	25	25	24	24	25	25
(2) 26	24	--	26	24	24	23	23
(3) 27	22	27	27	23	23	24	24
(4) 16	16	16	16	16	16	13	13
BURNETT							
(1) 27	26	23	27	26	26	23	23
(2) 27	23	24	27	24	24	23	23
(3) 26	25	24	26	25	25	20	20

TABLE NO. 8: CONTINUED

SCHOOL, TEACHER, AND CLASS SIZE	BIRTH DATE	NUMBER OF FULL DAYS	SEX	PRE-TEST		POST-TEST	
				GES	STANINE	GES	STANINE
FREMONT							
(1) 27	22	18	27	23	23	21	21
(2) 8	6	7	8	7	7	7	7
(3) 23	16	19	23	16	16	18	18
(4) 12	11	11	12	10	10	10	10
HUNTERS POINT II							
(1) 14	--	7	14	14	14	8	8
(2) 21	14	--	21	18	18	6	6
JEDEDIAH SMITH							
(1) 10	9	--	10	9	9	9	9
(2) 19	19	--	19	16	16	17	17
(3) 23	23	23	23	20	20	22	22
(4) 22	22	22	22	20	20	21	21
SIR FRANCIS DRAKE							
(1) 24	21	22	24	19	18	23	23
(2) 20	16	15	20	17	17	15	15
(3) 23	13	--	23	21	21	17	17
(4) 22	18	21	22	22	22	21	21

TABLE NO. 9: SEED PROJECT SCHOOLS: ETHNIC COMPOSITION, ALL GRADES FOR 1970-1971 ACADEMIC YEAR

SCHOOLS		BLACKS	AMERICAN INDIAN or NATIVE AMERICAN	ORIENTAL	SPANISH SURNAME	OTHER WHITE	OTHER	TOTAL
ALL SCHOOLS	N	3216	3	68	89	60	49	3485
	%	92.3	.09	2.0	2.6	1.7	1.4	100
ALL HALLOWS		NO DATA AVAILABLE						
BAYVIEW	N	460	--	34	14	3	7	518
	%	88.8	--	6.6	2.7	.6	1.3	100
BRET HARTE	N	562	--	12	15	17	7	613
	%	91.7	--	2	2.4	2.8	1.1	100
BURNETT	N	539	3	10	16	6	--	574
	%	93.9	.5	1.7	2.8	1.1	--	100
FREMONT	N	314	--	9	32	21	--	376
	%	83.5	--	2.4	8.5	5.6	--	100

TABLE NO. 9: CONTINUED

SCHOOLS		BLACKS	AMERICAN INDIAN or NATIVE AMERICAN	ORIENTAL	SPANISH SURNAME	OTHER WHITE	OTHER	TOTAL
HUNTERS POINT II	N	225	--	--	3	2	19	249
	%	90.4	--	--	1.2	.8	7.6	100
JEDEDIAH SMITH	N	571	--	1	6	6	9	593
	%	96.3	--	.2	1.0	1.0	1.5	100
SIR FRANCIS DRAKE	N	545	--	2	3	5	7	562
	%	97.0	--	.4	.5	.9	1.2	100

Source: William L. Cobb (Assistant Superintendent for Human Relations), Racial Estimates of Pupils Attending San Francisco Public Schools: September 23, 1970 (Mimeographed report; San Francisco: San Francisco Unified School District, 1970).

TABLE NO. 10: SEED PROJECT FIRST GRADE STUDENTS' SEX: FREQUENCY AND PROPORTIONAL DISTRIBUTIONS BY SCHOOL

SCHOOLS	BOYS		GIRLS		TOTAL	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
ALL SCHOOLS	302	53	265	47	567	100
ALL HALLOWS	28	48	30	52	58	100
BAYVIEW	48	67	24	33	72	100
BRET HARTE	49	46	57	54	106	100
BURNETT	60	53	53	47	113	100
FREMONT	11	46	13	54	24	100
HUNTERS POINT II	10	56	8	44	18	100
JEDEDIAH SMITH	47	53	42	47	89	100
SIR FRANCIS DRAKE	49	56	38	44	87	100

TABLE NO. 11: SEED PROJECT SECOND GRADE STUDENTS' SEX:
FREQUENCY AND PROPORTIONAL DISTRIBUTIONS BY SCHOOL

SCHOOLS	BOYS		GIRLS		TOTAL	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
ALL SCHOOLS	279	52	258	48	537	100
ALL HALLOWS	27	45	33	55	60	100
BAYVIEW	27	47	30	53	57	100
BRET HARTE	46	51	44	49	90	100
BURNETT	52	63	30	37	82	100
FREMONT	23	52	21	48	44	100
HUNTERS POINT II	25	60	17	40	42	100
JEDEDIAH SMITH	42	51	41	49	83	100
SIR FRANCIS DRAKE	37	47	42	53	79	100

TABLE NO. 12: SEED PROJECT THIRD GRADE STUDENTS' SEX:
FREQUENCY AND PROPORTIONAL DISTRIBUTIONS BY SCHOOL

SCHOOLS	BOYS		GIRLS		TOTAL	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
ALL SCHOOLS	312	52	290	48	602	100
ALL HALLOWS	37	45	46	55	83	100
BAYVIEW	41	53	36	47	77	100
BRET HARTE	51	54	43	46	94	100
BURNETT	32	40	48	60	80	100
FREMONT	41	59	29	41	70	100
HUNTERS POINT II	18	51	17	49	35	100
JEDEDIAH SMITH	44	59	30	41	74	100
SIR FRANCIS DRAKE	48	54	41	46	89	100

TABLE NO. 13: SEED PROJECT FIRST GRADE STUDENTS' DECIMAL AGES:
MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, FREQUENCY AND PROPORTIONAL DISTRIBUTIONS BY SCHOOL AND SEX

SCHOOLS	TOTAL	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	DECIMAL AGE CATEGORIES									
				5-5.9 Yrs		6-6.9 Yrs		7-7.9 Yrs		8-8.9 Yrs		9-9.9 Yrs	
				N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
ALL SCHOOLS													
Boys	132	7.14	.37	1	1	39	30	89	67	3	2	--	--
Girls	122	7.14	.35	1	1	24	20	94	77	3	2	--	--
Boys and Girls	254	7.14	.36	2	1	63	25	183	72	6	2	--	--
ALL HALLOWS													
Boys	NO DATA AVAILABLE												
Girls	NO DATA AVAILABLE												
Boys and Girls	NO DATA AVAILABLE												
BAYVIEW													
Boys	NO DATA AVAILABLE												
Girls	NO DATA AVAILABLE												
Boys and Girls	NO DATA AVAILABLE												
BRET HARTE													
Boys	24	7.17	.36	--	--	6	25	17	71	1	4	--	--
Girls	29	7.15	.30	--	--	5	17	24	83	--	--	--	--
Boys and Girls	53	7.16	.32	--	--	11	21	41	77	1	2	--	--

TABLE NO. 13: CONTINUED

SCHOOLS	TOTAL	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	DECIMAL AGE CATEGORIES									
				5-5.9 Yrs		6-6.9 Yrs		7-7.9 Yrs		8-8.9 Yrs		9-9.9 Yrs	
				N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
BURNETT													
Boys	31	7.19	.29	--	--	7	23	24	77	--	--	--	--
Girls	31	7.10	.39	--	--	8	26	22	71	1	3	--	--
Boys and Girls	62	7.15	.34	--	--	15	24	46	74	1	2	--	--
FREMONT													
Boys	9	6.89	.57	1	11	3	33	5	56	--	--	--	--
Girls	6	7.05	.20	--	--	1	17	5	83	--	--	--	--
Boys and Girls	15	6.95	.45	1	7	4	26	10	67	--	--	--	--
HUNTERS POINT II													
Boys	6	6.90	.26	--	--	5	83	1	17	--	--	--	--
Girls	5	7.14	.15	--	--	--	--	5	100	--	--	--	--
Boys and Girls	11	7.01	.24	--	--	5	45	6	55	--	--	--	--
JEDEDIAH SMITH													
Boys	46	7.19	.41	--	--	12	26	32	70	2	4	--	--
Girls	40	7.17	.40	1	3	8	20	29	73	2	5	--	--
Boys and Girls	86	7.18	.40	1	1	20	23	61	71	4	5	--	--

TABLE NO. 13: CONTINUED

SCHOOLS	TOTAL	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	DECIMAL AGE CATEGORIES									
				5-5.9 Yrs		6-6.9 Yrs		7-7.9 Yrs		8-8.9 Yrs		9-9.9 Yrs	
				N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
SIR FRANCIS DRAKE													
Boys	16	7.07	.27	--	--	6	37	10	63	--	--	--	--
Girls	11	7.22	.31	--	--	2	18	9	83	--	--	--	--
Boys and Girls	27	7.13	.29	--	--	8	30	19	70	--	--	--	--

TABLE NO. 14: SEED PROJECT SECOND GRADE STUDENTS' DECIMAL AGES:
MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, FREQUENCY AND PROPORTIONAL DISTRIBUTIONS BY SCHOOL AND SEX

SCHOOLS	TOTAL	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	DECIMAL AGE CATEGORIES									
				6-6.9 Yrs		7-7.9 Yrs		8-8.9 Yrs		9-9.9 Yrs		10-10.9 Yrs	
				N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
ALL SCHOOLS													
Boys	183	8.22	.50	1	1	45	25	120	66	15	8	2	1
Girls	163	8.19	.45	1	1	39	24	111	68	12	7	0	--
Boys and Girls	346	8.20	.48	2	1	84	24	231	67	27	8	2	1
ALL HALLOWS													
Boys	21	7.88	.53	1	5	9	43	11	52	--	--	--	--
Girls	27	7.93	.49	1	4	10	37	15	55	1	4	--	--
Boys and Girls	48	7.91	.50	2	4	19	40	26	54	1	2	--	--
BAYVIEW													
Boys				NO DATA AVAILABLE									
Girls				NO DATA AVAILABLE									
Boys and Girls				NO DATA AVAILABLE									
BRET HARTE													
Boys	18	8.07	.14	--	--	2	11	16	89	--	--	--	--
Girls	21	8.16	.42	--	--	5	24	14	67	2	9	--	--
Boys and Girls	39	8.12	.32	--	--	7	18	30	77	2	5	--	--

TABLE NO. 14: CONTINUED

SCHOOLS	TOTAL	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	DECIMAL AGE CATEGORIES									
				6-6.9 Yrs		7-7.9 Yrs		8-8.9 Yrs		9-9.9 Yrs		10-10.9 Yr	
				N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
BURNETT													
Boys	49	8.36	.52	--	--	11	23	30	61	8	16	--	--
Girls	27	8.20	.43	--	--	8	29	18	67	1	4	--	--
Boys and Girls	76	8.30	.49	--	--	19	25	48	63	9	12	--	--
FREMONT													
Boys	17	8.23	.57	--	--	6	35	10	59	--	--	1	6
Girls	16	8.02	.27	--	--	5	31	11	69	--	--	--	--
Boys and Girls	33	8.13	.45	--	--	11	33	21	64	--	--	1	3
HUNTERS POINT II													
Boys	10	8.64	.71	--	--	1	10	5	50	3	30	1	10
Girls	6	8.52	.73	--	--	1	17	3	50	2	33	--	--
Boys and Girls	16	8.59	.70	--	--	2	13	8	50	5	31	1	6
JEDEDIAH SMITH													
Boys	42	8.25	.44	--	--	8	19	30	71	4	10	--	--
Girls	40	8.32	.36	--	--	3	8	33	82	4	10	--	--
Boys and Girls	82	8.29	.40	--	--	11	13	63	77	8	10	--	--

TABLE NO. 14: CONTINUED

SCHOOLS	TOTAL	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	DECIMAL AGE CATEGORIES									
				6-6.9 Yrs		7-7.9 Yrs		8-8.9 Yrs		9-9.9 Yrs		10-10.9 Yrs	
				N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
SIR FRANCIS DRAKE													
Boys	26	8.09	.38	--	--	8	31	18	69	0	0	--	--
Girls	26	8.29	.43	--	--	7	27	17	65	2	8	--	--
Boys and Girls	52	8.19	.41	--	--	15	29	35	67	2	4	--	--

TABLE NO. 15: SEED PROJECT THIRD GRADE STUDENTS' DECIMAL AGES:
MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, FREQUENCY AND PROPORTIONAL DISTRIBUTIONS BY SCHOOL AND SEX

SCHOOLS	TOTAL	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	DECIMAL AGE CATEGORIES									
				6-6.9 Yrs		7-7.9 Yrs		8-8.9 Yrs		9-9.9 Yrs		10-10.9 Yrs	
				N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
ALL SCHOOLS													
Boys	244	9.19	.50	--	--	0	0	63	26	159	65	22	9
Girls	245	9.06	.42	--	--	3	1	79	32	156	64	7	3
Boys and Girls	489	9.12	.47	--	--	3	1	142	29	315	64	29	6
ALL HALLOWS													
Boys	27	8.96	.26	--	--	--	--	13	48	14	52	--	--
Girls	38	9.08	.33	--	--	--	--	13	34	24	63	1	3
Boys and Girls	65	9.03	.31	--	--	--	--	26	40	38	58	1	2
BAYVIEW													
Boys	24	8.98	.54	--	--	--	--	9	38	14	58	1	4
Girls	29	8.87	.39	--	--	--	--	15	52	14	48	-	--
Boys and Girls	53	8.92	.46	--	--	--	--	24	45	28	53	1	2
BRET HARTE													
Boys	45	9.30	.57	--	--	0	--	10	22	27	60	8	18
Girls	42	9.13	.46	--	--	1	2	11	26	28	67	2	5
Boys and Girls	87	9.22	.52	--	--	1	1	21	24	55	63	10	11

TABLE NO. 15: CONTINUED

SCHOOLS	TOTAL	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	DECIMAL AGE CATEGORIES									
				6-6.9 Yrs		7-7.9 Yrs		8-8.9 Yrs		9-9.9 Yrs		10-10.9 Yrs	
				N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
BURNETT													
Boys	30	9.22	.55	--	--	0	--	8	27	18	60	4	13
Girls	44	9.11	.49	--	--	1	2	13	30	26	59	4	9
Boys and Girls	74	9.15	.51	--	--	1	1	21	28	44	60	8	11
FREMONT													
Boys	32	9.28	.48	--	--	0	0	8	25	20	63	4	12
Girls	23	9.03	.37	--	--	1	4	6	26	16	70	0	0
Boys and Girls	25	9.17	.45	--	--	1	2	14	25	36	66	4	7
H NTERS POINT II													
Boys	6	8.92	.69	--	--	--	--	2	33	4	67	--	--
Girls	8	8.84	.50	--	--	--	--	4	50	4	50	--	--
Boys and Girls	14	8.87	.56	--	--	--	--	6	43	8	57	--	--
JEDEDIAH SMITH													
Boys	43	9.21	.44	--	--	--	--	8	18	33	77	2	5
Girls	30	8.98	.37	--	--	--	--	12	40	18	60	0	0
Boys and Girls	73	9.12	.43	--	--	--	--	20	27	51	70	2	3

TABLE NO. 15: CONTINUED

SCHOOLS	TOTAL	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	DECIMAL AGE CATEGORIES									
				6-6.9 Yrs		7-7.9 Yrs		8-8.9 Yrs		9-9.9 Yrs		10-10.9 Yrs	
				N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
SIR FRANCIS DRAKE													
Boys	37	9.28	.46	--	--	--	--	5	14	29	78	3	8
Girls	31	9.18	.37	--	--	--	--	5	16	26	84	0	0
Boys and Girls	68	9.24	.42	--	--	--	--	10	15	55	81	3	4

TABLE NO. 16: SEED PROJECT FIRST GRADE STUDENTS' ATTENDANCE, BY SCHOOLS, 1969-1970 AND 1970-1971

SCHOOLS	MAY 1971 (TOTAL SCHOOL DAYS: 188)			MAY 1970 (TOTAL SCHOOL DAYS: 181)		
	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
ALL SCHOOLS	345	146.09	35.61	437	151.83	35.01
ALL HALLOWS	28	168.04	6.22	56	168.84	5.76
BAYVIEW	44	155.55	34.53	27	163.00	24.58
BRET HARTE	40	143.67	30.06	68	153.72	32.43
BURNETT	51	155.57	31.16	80	155.11	32.19
FREMONT	18	70.11	15.72	47	151.72	39.22
HUNTERS POINT II	---	---	---	47	132.27	41.83
JEDEDIAH SMITH	88	149.18	34.62	20	161.55	14.97
SIR FRANCIS DRAKE	76	141.87	29.39	104	140.47	42.12

TABLE NO. 17: SEED PROJECT SECOND GRADE STUDENTS' ATTENDANCE, BY SCHOOLS, 1969-1970 AND 1970-1971

SCHOOLS	MAY 1971 (TOTAL SCHOOL DAYS: 188)			MAY 1970 (TOTAL SCHOOL DAYS: 181)		
	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
ALL SCHOOLS	376	157.16	26.68	457	157.27	29.47
ALL HALLOWS	56	166.89	6.93	64	166.84	7.48
BAYVIEW	51	150.76	37.83	62	165.65	21.08
BRET HARTE	32	158.78	28.63	61	154.38	30.93
BURNETT	66	158.56	20.28	77	153.12	38.02
FREMONT	36	146.92	41.65	52	156.62	29.60
HUNTERS POINT II	13	158.85	16.17	37	144.19	38.25
JEDEDIAH SMITH	69	168.38	16.08	---	---	---
SIR FRANCIS DRAKE	53	142.25	22.90	104	156.14	28.25

TABLE NO. 18: SEED PROJECT THIRD GRADE STUDENTS' ATTENDANCE, BY SCHOOLS, 1969-1970 AND 1970-1971

SCHOOLS	MAY 1971 (TOTAL SCHOOL DAYS: 188)			MAY 1970 (TOTAL SCHOOL DAYS: 181)		
	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
ALL SCHOOLS	415	160.45	19.91	559	160.19	25.23
ALL HALLOWS	45	167.93	6.16	70	168.09	9.08
BAYVIEW	66	162.23	14.39	71	170.58	9.01
BRET HARTE	68	164.47	18.69	73	154.38	32.93
BURNETT	71	157.03	27.09	89	162.67	25.24
FREMONT	55	158.24	16.89	72	159.51	24.54
HUNTERS POINT II	7	161.57	16.51	41	146.93	37.08
JEDEDIAH SMITH	45	162.51	27.69	38	159.00	21.96
SIR FRANCIS DRAKE	58	152.47	16.05	105	155.90	25.89

TABLE NO. 19: SEED PROJECT FIRST GRADE STUDENTS' PERCENT OF FULL DAYS IN PROGRAM: BY SCHOOLS AND SEX

SCHOOLS	N	MEAN %	STND. DEV. %	PERCENT OF FULL DAYS IN PROGRAM							
				1-69		70-79		80-89		90-100	
				N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
L SCHOOLS											
Boys	176	82.36	19.52	36	20.46	10	5.68	44	25.00	86	48.86
Girls	169	80.84	20.38	36	21.30	20	11.83	37	21.89	76	44.98
Boys & Girls	345	81.62	19.93	72	20.88	30	8.70	81	23.48	162	46.96
L HALLOWS											
Boys	12	93.11	3.42	--	--	--	--	2	16.67	10	83.33
Girls	16	94.45	3.52	--	--	--	--	2	12.50	14	87.50
Boys & Girls	28	93.87	3.48	--	--	--	--	4	14.29	24	85.71
YVIEW											
Boys	26	89.00	11.46	2	7.70	2	7.69	7	26.92	15	57.69
Girls	18	83.86	27.05	3	16.67	-	--	2	11.11	13	72.22
Boys & Girls	44	86.90	19.29	5	11.36	2	4.55	9	20.45	28	63.64
CT HARTE											
Boys	14	82.12	19.86	3	21.43	--	--	6	42.86	5	35.71
Girls	26	79.27	15.23	7	26.92	5	19.23	7	26.92	7	26.92
Boys & Girls	40	80.27	16.79	10	25.00	5	12.50	13	32.50	12	30.00

TABLE NO. 19: CONTINUED

SCHOOLS	N	MEAN %	STND. DEV. %	PERCENT OF FULL DAYS IN PROGRAM							
				1-69		70-79		80-89		90-100	
				N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
NETT											
Boys	25	86.48	19.69	3	12.00	1	4.00	5	20.00	16	64.00
Girls	26	87.32	15.29	4	15.39	2	7.69	3	11.54	17	65.38
Boys & Girls	51	86.91	17.41	7	13.72	3	5.88	8	15.69	33	64.71
MONT											
Boys	8	41.27	8.22	8	100	--	--	--	--	--	--
Girls	10	37.49	9.28	10	100	--	--	--	--	--	--
Boys & Girls	18	39.17	8.78	18	100	--	--	--	--	--	--
TERS POINT II											
Boys				NO DATA AVAILABLE							
Girls				NO DATA AVAILABLE							
Boys & Girls				NO DATA AVAILABLE							
EDIAH SMITH											
Boys	47	82.97	19.39	12	25.54	1	2.13	10	21.27	24	51.06
Girls	41	83.77	19.51	6	14.64	6	14.63	8	19.51	21	51.22
Boys & Girls	88	83.34	19.34	18	20.46	7	7.95	18	20.45	45	51.14

TABLE NO. 19: CONTINUED

SCHOOLS	N	MEAN %	STND. DEV. %	PERCENT OF FULL DAYS IN PROGRAM							
				1-69		70-79		80-89		90-100	
				N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
FRANCIS DRAKE											
ys	44	80.07	18.26	8	18.18	6	13.64	14	31.82	16	36.36
rls	32	78.14	13.69	6	18.76	7	21.87	15	46.87	4	12.50
ys & Girls	76	79.26	16.42	14	18.42	13	17.11	29	38.16	20	26.31

TABLE NO. 20: SEED PROJECT SECOND GRADE STUDENTS' PERCENT OF FULL DAYS IN PROGRAM: BY SCHOOLS AND SEX

SCHOOLS	N	MEAN %	STND. DEV. %	PERCENT OF FULL DAYS IN PROGRAM							
				1-69		70-79		80-89		90-100	
				N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
SCHOOLS											
oys	194	89.41	11.83	11	5.68	13	6.70	50	25.77	120	61.85
irls	182	86.08	17.47	21	11.54	12	6.59	45	24.73	104	57.14
oys & Girls	376	87.80	14.90	32	8.51	25	6.65	95	25.27	224	59.57
HALLOWS											
oys	24	93.92	3.69	--	--	--	--	4	16.67	20	83.33
irls	32	92.72	3.97	--	--	--	--	8	25.00	24	75.00
oys & Girls	56	93.24	3.87	--	--	--	--	12	21.43	44	78.57
VIEW											
oys	25	87.96	10.92	1	4.00	2	8.00	9	36.00	13	52.00
irls	26	80.64	27.41	5	19.23	--	--	5	19.23	16	61.54
oys & Girls	51	84.23	21.13	6	11.77	2	3.92	14	27.45	29	56.86
HARTE											
oys	15	86.70	17.32	2	13.34	1	6.67	4	26.66	8	53.23
irls	17	90.47	15.04	1	5.88	2	11.77	--	--	14	82.35
oys & Girls	32	88.70	15.99	3	9.38	3	9.38	4	12.50	22	68.75

TABLE NO. 20: CONTINUED

SCHOOLS	N	MEAN %	STND. DEV. %	PERCENT OF FULL DAYS IN PROGRAM							
				1-69		70-79		80-89		90-100	
				N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
RNETT											
Boys	42	90.38	8.78	1	2.38	2	4.76	11	25.19	28	66.67
Girls	24	85.43	14.46	3	12.51	3	12.50	6	25.00	12	50.00
Boys & Girls	66	88.58	11.33	4	6.08	5	7.57	17	25.75	40	60.60
MONT											
oys	21	84.62	20.48	4	19.04	1	4.76	2	9.53	14	66.67
irls	15	78.51	27.04	3	20.01	1	6.66	4	26.66	7	46.67
oys & Girls	36	82.08	23.27	7	19.46	2	5.56	6	16.67	21	58.33
TERS POINT II											
oys	9	90.75	5.31	--	--	--	--	3	33.33	6	66.67
irls	4	84.22	14.55	1	25.00			2	50.00	1	25.00
oys & Girls	13	88.74	9.03	1	7.69	--	--	5	38.46	7	53.85
EDIAH SMITH											
oys	34	95.20	7.51	--	--	3	8.82	4	11.77	27	79.41
irls	35	92.96	10.20	1	2.86	1	2.86	6	17.14	27	74.14
oys & Girls	69	94.07	8.98	1	1.45	4	5.80	10	14.49	54	78.26

TABLE NO. 20: CONTINUED

CHOOLS	N	MEAN %	STND. DEV. %	PERCENT OF FULL DAYS IN PROGRAM							
				1-69		70-79		80-89		90-100	
				N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
ANCIS DRAKE											
s	24	81.91	10.96	3	12.50	4	16.67	13	54.17	4	16.67
ls	29	77.44	14.54	7	24.14	5	17.24	14	48.28	3	10.34
s & Girls	53	79.47	12.79	10	18.87	9	16.98	27	50.94	7	13.21

TABLE NO. 21: SEED PROJECT THIRD GRADE STUDENTS' PERCENT OF FULL DAYS IN PROGRAM: BY SCHOOLS AND SEX

SCHOOLS	N	MEAN %	STND. DEV. %	PERCENT OF FULL DAYS IN PROGRAM							
				1-69		70-79		80-89		90-100	
				N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
SCHOOLS											
ys	208	90.39	9.27	11	5.29	10	4.81	57	27.40	130	62.50
rls	207	88.88	12.70	15	7.24	13	6.28	47	22.71	132	63.77
ys & Girls	415	89.64	11.13	26	6.25	23	5.54	104	25.06	262	63.14
ALLOWS											
ys	19	93.59	3.72	--	--	--	--	4	21.05	15	78.95
rls	26	93.98	3.29	--	--	--	--	2	7.69	24	92.31
ys & Girls	45	93.82	3.44	--	--	--	--	6	13.33	39	86.67
EW											
ys	32	89.65	10.34	3	9.37	1	3.13	8	25.00	20	62.50
rls	34	91.55	4.99	--	--	--	--	13	38.24	21	61.76
ys & Girls	66	90.63	8.04	3	4.55	1	1.52	21	31.82	41	62.12
HARTE											
ys	35	91.06	12.69	3	8.58	1	2.86	4	11.43	27	77.14
rls	33	92.75	7.46	--	--	4	12.12	5	15.15	24	72.73
s & Girls	68	91.88	10.44	3	4.41	5	7.35	9	13.24	51	75.00

TABLE NO. 21: CONTINUED

OOLS	N	MEAN %	STND. DEV. %	PERCENT OF FULL DAYS IN PROGRAM							
				1-69		70-79		80-89		90-100	
				N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
	27	91.64	9.62	1	3.70	--	--	7	25.93	19	70.37
	44	85.32	17.36	5	11.36	3	6.82	9	20.45	27	61.36
& Girls	71	87.73	15.14	6	8.46	3	4.23	16	22.54	46	64.79
	32	89.30	7.26	--	--	4	12.50	11	34.38	17	53.13
	23	87.15	11.88	4	17.39	1	4.35	5	21.74	13	56.52
& Girls	55	88.40	9.43	4	7.27	5	9.09	16	29.09	30	54.55
POINT II											
	4	86.17	10.79	--	--	1	25.00	1	25.00	2	50.00
	3	95.72	1.62	--	--	--	--	--	--	3	100.00
& Girls	7	90.26	9.22	--	--	1	14.29	1	14.29	5	71.43
H SMITH											
	28	93.68	5.43	--	--	--	--	9	32.14	19	67.86
	17	86.03	23.87	2	11.76	--	--	2	11.76	12	70.58
& Girls	45	90.79	15.47	3	6.66	--	--	11	24.44	31	68.89

TABLE NO. 21: CONTINUED

LS	N	MEAN %	STND. DEV. %	PERCENT OF FULL DAYS IN PROGRAM							
				1-69		70-79		80-89		90-100	
				N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
IS DRAKE											
	31	86.07	8.78	4	12.90	3	9.68	13	41.94	11	35.48
	27	84.15	9.23	3	11.11	5	18.52	11	40.74	8	29.63
Girls	58	85.18	8.96	7	12.07	8	13.79	24	41.38	19	32.76

TABLE NO. 22: SEED PROJECT FIRST GRADE STUDENTS' MEAN NUMBER OF FULL DAYS IN ATTENDANCE: KRUSKAL-WALLIS ONE WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE TEST BY RANKS, H

SCHOOLS	1969-1970 181 DAYS		1970-1971 188 DAYS	
	RANK	MEAN ATTENDANCE	RANK	MEAN ATTENDANCE
ALL HALLOWS	1	168.84	2	168.04
BAYVIEW	3	163.00	6	155.55
BRET HARTE	8	153.72	11	143.67
BURNETT	7	155.11	5	155.57
FREMONT	9	151.72	14	70.11
HUNTERS POINT II	--	132.27	--	--
JEDEDIAH SMITH	4	161.55	10	149.18
SIR FRANCIS DRAKE	13	140.47	12	141.87
TOTAL RANKS	45		60	
RANKS SQUARED	2025		3600	

$H = .91 \qquad H_o = X^2 = 6.64$ (1 df, a = .01)

Not Statistically Significant

TABLE NO. 23: SEED PROJECT SECOND GRADE STUDENTS' MEAN NUMBER OF FULL DAYS IN ATTENDANCE: KRUSKAL-WALLIS ONE WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE TEST BY RANKS, II

SCHOOLS	1969-1970 181 DAYS		1970-1971 188 DAYS	
	RANK	MEAN ATTENDANCE	RANK	MEAN ATTENDANCE
ALL HALLOWS	2	166.84	1	166.89
BAYVIEW	3	165.65	11	150.76
BRET HARTE	9	154.38	5	158.78
BURNETT	10	153.12	6	158.56
FREMONT	7	156.62	12	146.92
HUNTERS POINT II	13	144.19	4	158.85
JEDEDIAH SMITH	--	--	--	168.38
SIR FRANCIS DRAKE	8	156.14	14	142.25
TOTAL RANKS	52		53	
RANKS SQUARED	2704		2809	

$H = .99$ $H_o = X^2 = 6.64$ (1 df, a = .01)

Not Statistically Significant

TABLE NO. 24: SEED PROJECT THIRD GRADE STUDENTS' MEAN NUMBER OF FULL DAYS IN ATTENDANCE: KRUSKAL-WALLIS ONE WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE TEST BY RANKS, H

SCHOOLS	1969-1970 181 DAYS		1970-1971 188 DAYS	
	RANK	MEAN ATTENDANCE	RANK	MEAN ATTENDANCE
ALL HALLOWS	2	168.09	3	167.93
BAYVIEW	1	170.58	7	162.23
BRET HARTE	13	154.38	4	164.47
BURNETT	5	162.67	12	157.03
FREMONT	9	159.51	11	158.24
HUNTERS POINT II	16	146.93	8	161.57
JEDEDIAH SMITH	10	159.00	6	162.51
SIR FRANCIS DRAKE	14	155.90	15	152.47
TOTAL RANKS	70		66	
RANKS SQUARED	4900		4356	

$H = .04$ $H_o = X^2 = 6.64$ (1 df, a = .01)

Not Statistically Significant

TABLE NO. 25: THE WILCOXON MATCHED-PAIRS SIGNED-RANKS TEST FOR THE FIRST GRADE: MEAN NUMBER OF FULL DAYS IN PROGRAM

SCHOOLS	MEAN NUMBER OF FULL DAYS IN PROGRAM		DIFFERENCE Y - X	RANK
	1969-1970 181 DAYS X	1970-1971 188 DAYS Y		
ALL HALLOWS	168.84	168.04	.80	-2
BAYVIEW	163.00	155.55	- 7.45	-4
BRET HARTE	153.72	143.67	-10.05	-5
BURNETT	155.11	155.57	.46	1
FREMONT	151.72	70.11	-81.61	-7
HUNTERS POINT II	132.27	--	--	--
JEDEDIAH SMITH	161.55	149.18	-12.37	-6
SIR FRANCIS DRAKE	140.47	141.87	1.40	3

$T = 4 \qquad T_o \leq 2 \quad (N = 7, a = .05)$

Statistically Significant

TABLE NO. 26: THE WILCOXON MATCHED-PAIRS SIGNED-RANKS TEST FOR THE SECOND GRADE: MEAN NUMBER OF FULL DAYS IN PROGRAM

SCHOOLS	MEAN NUMBER OF FULL DAYS IN PROGRAM		DIFFERENCE Y - X	RANK
	1969-1970 181 DAYS X	1970-1971 188 DAYS Y		
ALL HALLOWS	166.84	166.89	.05	1
BAYVIEW	165.65	150.76	-14.89	-7
BRET HARTE	154.38	158.78	4.40	2
BURNETT	153.12	158.56	5.44	3
FREMONT	156.62	146.92	- 9.70	-4
HUNTERS POINT II	144.19	158.85	14.66	6
JEDEDIAH SMITH	--	168.38	--	--
SIR FRANCIS DRAKE	156.14	142.25	-13.89	-5

$T = 16 \qquad T_o \leq 2 \quad (N = 7, a = .05)$

Statistically Significant

TABLE NO. 27: THE WILCOXON MATCHED-PAIRS SIGNED-RANKS TEST FOR THE THIRD GRADE: MEAN NUMBER OF FULL DAYS IN PROGRAM

SCHOOLS	MEAN NUMBER OF FULL DAYS IN PROGRAM		DIFFERENCE Y - X	RANK
	1969-1970 181 DAYS X	1970-1971 188 DAYS Y		
ALL HALLOWS	168.09	167.93	- .16	1
BAYVIEW	170.58	162.23	- 8.35	6
BRET HARTE	154.38	164.47	10.09	+7
BURNETT	162.67	157.03	- 5.64	5
FREMONT	159.51	158.24	- 1.27	2
HUNTERS POINT II	146.93	161.57	14.64	+8
JEDEDIAH SMITH	159.00	162.51	3.51	+4
SIR FRANCIS DRAKE	155.90	152.47	- 3.43	3

$T = 19 \quad T_o = 4 \quad (N = 8, a = .05)$

Statistically Significant

TABLE NO. 28: SEED PROJECT FIRST GRADE STUDENTS: READING ACHIEVEMENT GRADE EQUIVALENT SCORES, BY SCHOOLS AND SEX

SCHOOLS	N	MEANS	STANDARD DEVIATIONS
ALL SCHOOLS			
Boys	237	1.69	.49
Girls	233	1.84	.60
Boys and Girls	460	1.76	.55
ALL HALLOWS			
Boys	21	1.73	.49
Girls	27	1.79	.44
Boys and Girls	48	1.76	.46
BAYVIEW			
Boys	39	1.63	.34
Girls	23	1.65	.36
Boys and Girls	62	1.64	.34
BRET HARTE			
Boys	34	1.84	.66
Girls	46	2.11	.75
Boys and Girls	80	1.99	.72
BURNETT			
Boys	41	1.99	.58
Girls	37	2.32	.72
Boys and Girls	78	2.14	.67
FREMONT			
Boys	9	1.52	.36
Girls	11	1.57	.27
Boys and Girls	20	1.55	.31

TABLE NO. 28: CONTINUED

SCHOOLS	N	MEANS	STA... DEVI...
HUNTERS POINT II			
Boys	9	1.73	.1...
Girls	7	1.79	.3...
Boys and Girls	10	1.76	.2...
JEDEDIAH SMITH			
Boys	42	1.52	.4...
Girls	39	1.51	.3...
Boys and Girls	81	1.51	.4...
SIR FRANCIS DRAKE			
Boys	42	1.51	.3...
Girls	33	1.59	.2...
Boys and Girls	75	1.55	.2...

TABLE NO. 29: SEED PROJECT SECOND GRADE STUDENTS: READING ACHIEVEMENT GRADE EQUIVALENT SCORES, BY SCHOOLS AND SEX

SCHOOLS	N	MEANS	STANDARD DEVIATIONS
ALL SCHOOLS			
Boys	234	2.28	.74
Girls	207	2.46	.85
Boys and Girls	441	2.36	.80
ALL HALLOWS			
Boys	20	2.56	.46
Girls	27	2.50	.53
Boys and Girls	47	2.53	.50
BAYVIEW			
Boys	26	1.90	.49
Girls	25	2.46	1.06
Boys and Girls	51	2.18	.86
BRET HARTE			
Boys	41	2.21	1.00
Girls	36	2.44	1.02
Boys and Girls	77	2.32	1.01
BURNETT			
Boys	42	2.55	.67
Girls	23	2.84	.96
Boys and Girls	65	2.65	.79
FREMONT			
Boys	20	2.26	.62
Girls	15	2.55	.72
Boys and Girls	35	2.39	.67

TABLE NO. 29: CONTINUED

SCHOOLS	N	MEANS	STANDARD DEVIATIONS
HUNTERS POINT II			
Boys	11	1.73	.44
Girls	5	1.96	.57
Boys and Girls	16	1.80	.47
JEDEDIAH SMITH			
Boys	40	2.43	.82
Birls	38	2.44	.83
Boys and Girls	78	2.44	.82
SIR FRANCIS DRAKE			
Boys	34	2.19	.58
Girls	38	2.25	.70
Boys and Girls	72	2.22	.64

TABLE NO. 30: SEED PROJECT THIRD GRADE STUDENTS: RADING ACHIEVEMENT GRADE EQUIVALENT SCORES, BY SCHOOLS AND SEX

SCHOOLS	N	MEANS	STANDARD DEVIATIONS
ALL SCHOOLS			
Boys	235	2.51	.81
Girls	225	2.76	.77
Boys and Girls	460	2.63	.80
ALL HALLOWS			
Boys	10	3.55	.96
Girls	22	3.65	.62
Boys and Girls	32	3.62	.73
BAYVIEW			
Boys	30	2.38	.61
Girls	32	2.84	.77
Boys and Girls	62	2.62	.73
BRET HARTE			
Boys	48	2.53	.77
Girls	37	2.55	.59
Boys and Girls	85	2.54	.69
BURNETT			
Boys	27	2.75	.80
Girls	39	2.79	.66
Boys and Girls	66	2.78	.72
FREMONT			
Boys	32	2.22	.47
Girls	24	2.60	.64
Boys and Girls	56	2.38	.57

TABLE NO. 30: CONTINUED

SCHOOLS	N	MEANS	STANDARD DEVIATIONS
HUNTERS POINT II			
Boys	6	2.33	.91
Girls	8	2.37	.88
Boys and Girls	14	2.36	.86
JEDEDIAH SMITH			
Boys	41	2.65	1.06
Girls	28	2.85	.99
Boys and Girls	69	2.73	1.03
SIR FRANCIS DRAKE			
Boys	41	2.26	.59
Girls	35	2.40	.53
Boys and Girls	76	2.33	.56

TABLE NO. 31: SEED PROJECT FIRST GRADE STUDENTS' READING ACHIEVEMENT STANINE SCORES: BY SCHOOLS AND SEX

SCHOOLS	N	MEANS	STANDARD DEVIATIONS
ALL SCHOOLS			
Boys	237	4.15	1.86
Girls	223	4.70	2.15
Boys and Girls	460	4.42	2.02
ALL HALLOWS			
Boys	21	4.43	1.99
Girls	27	4.70	1.92
Boys and Girls	48	4.58	1.93
BAYVIEW			
Boys	39	3.90	1.50
Girls	23	4.13	1.79
Boys and Girls	62	3.98	1.60
BRET HARTE			
Boys	34	4.62	2.13
Girls	46	5.57	2.41
Boys and Girls	80	5.16	2.33
BURNETT			
Boys	41	5.39	1.77
Girls	37	6.38	2.05
Boys and Girls	78	5.86	1.96
FREMONT			
Boys	9	3.44	1.59
Girls	11	3.73	1.42
Boys and Girls	20	3.60	1.47

TABLE NO. 31: CONTINUED

SCHOOLS	N	MEANS	STAND DEVIA
HUNTERS POINT II			
Boys	9	4.56	1.01
Girls	7	4.86	1.35
Boys and Girls	16	4.69	1.14
JEDEDIAH SMITH			
Boys	42	3.45	1.92
Girls	39	3.41	1.73
Boys and Girls	81	3.43	1.82
SIR FRANCIS DRAKE			
Boys	42	3.43	1.35
Girls	33	3.82	1.38
Boys and Girls	75	3.60	1.37

TABLE NO. 32: SEED PROJECT SECOND GRADE STUDENTS' READING ACHIEVEMENT STANINE SCORES, BY SCHOOLS AND SEX

SCHOOLS	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATIONS
ALL SCHOOLS			
Boys	234	3.87	1.55
Girls	206	4.15	1.64
Boys and Girls	440	4.00	1.60
ALL HALLOWS			
Boys	20	4.55	.89
Girls	27	4.33	1.11
Boys and Girls	47	4.43	1.02
BAYVIEW			
Boys	26	3.12	1.31
Girls	25	3.92	1.61
Boys and Girls	51	3.51	1.50
BRET HARTE			
Boys	41	3.63	2.11
Girls	36	2.08	4.08
Boys and Girls	77	3.84	2.09
BURNETT			
Boys	42	4.48	1.29
Girls	23	4.87	1.94
Boys and Girls	65	4.62	1.55
FREMONT			
Boys	20	3.90	1.21
Girls	14	4.36	1.28
Boys and Girls	34	4.09	1.24

TABLE NO. 32: CONTINUED

SCHOOLS	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATIONS
HUNTERS POINT II			
Boys	11	2.55	1.04
Girls	5	3.20	1.30
Boys and Girls	16	2.75	1.13
JEDEDIAH SMITH			
Boys	40	4.05	1.65
Girls	38	4.18	1.64
Boys and Girls	78	4.12	1.64
SIR FRANCIS DRAKE			
Boys	34	3.79	1.25
Girls	38	3.79	1.42
Boys and Girls	72	3.79	1.33

TABLE NO. 33: SEED PROJECT THIRD GRADE STUDENTS' READING ACHIEVEMENT STANINE SCORES, BY SCHOOLS AND SEX

SCHOOLS	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATIONS
ALL SCHOOLS			
Boys	235	2.33	1.52
Girls	225	2.84	1.51
Boys and Girls	460	2.58	1.54
ALL HALLOWS			
Boys	10	4.30	1.42
Girls	22	4.73	1.03
Boys and Girls	32	4.59	1.16
BAYVIEW			
Boys	30	2.20	1.06
Girls	32	2.91	1.47
Boys and Girls	62	2.56	1.33
BRET HARTE			
Boys	48	2.29	1.52
Girls	37	2.41	1.19
Boys and Girls	85	2.34	1.38
BURNETT			
Boys	27	2.93	1.69
Girls	39	2.79	1.36
Boys and Girls	66	2.85	1.49
FREMONT			
Boys	32	1.72	.85
Girls	24	2.54	1.35
Boys and Girls	56	2.07	1.16

TABLE NO. 33: CONTINUED

SCHOOLS	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATIONS
HUNTERS POINT II			
Boys	6	2.17	1.60
Girls	8	2.25	1.49
Boys and Girls	14	2.21	1.48
JEDEDIAH SMITH			
Boys	41	2.56	1.94
Girls	28	3.14	1.92
Boys and Girls	69	2.80	1.94
SIR FRANCIS DRAKE			
Boys	41	1.88	1.14
Girls	35	2.17	1.01
Boys and Girls	76	2.01	1.09

TABLE NO. 34: SEED PROJECT SECOND GRADE STUDENTS' GRADE EQUIVALENT SCORES: KRUSKAL-WALLIS ONE WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE TEST BY RANKS, II

SCHOOLS	PRE-TEST OCTOBER 1970		POST-TEST MAY 1971	
	RANK	MEAN GRADE EQUIVALENT SCORE	RANK	MEAN GRADE EQUIVALENT SCORE
ALL HALLOWS	8	1.96	2	2.53
BAYVIEW	13	1.56	7	2.18
BRET HARTE	16	1.28	5	2.32
BURNETT	10	1.72	1	2.65
FREMONT	11	1.65	4	2.39
HUNTERS POINT II	12	1.61	9	1.80
JEDEDIAH SMITH	15	1.37	3	2.44
SIR FRANCIS DRAKE	14	1.42	6	2.22
TOTAL RANKS	99		37	
RANKS SQUARED	9801		1369	

$H = 10.60$ $H_o = X^2 = 6.64$ (1 df, a = .01)

Statistically Significant

TABLE NO. 35: SEED PROJECT THIRD GRADE STUDENTS' GRADE EQUIVALENT SCORES: KRUSKAL-WALLIS ONE WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE TEST BY RANKS, II

SCHOOLS	PRE-TEST OCTOBER 1970		POST-TEST MAY 1971	
	RANK	MEAN GRADE EQUIVALENT SCORES	RANK	MEAN GRADE EQUIVALENT SCORES
ALL HALLOWS	6	2.46	1	3.62
BAYVIEW	12	2.08	4	2.62
BRET HARTE	13	2.07	5	2.54
BURNETT	9.5	2.33	2	2.78
FREMONT	11	2.21	7	2.38
HUNTERS POINT II	16	1.76	8	2.36
JEDEDIAH SMITH	14	1.95	3	2.73
SIR FRANCIS DRAKE	15	1.85	9.5	2.33
TOTAL RANKS	96.5		39.5	
RANKS SQUARED	9312.25		1560.25	

$H = 8.96$ $H_o = X^2 = 6.64$ (1 df, a = .01)

Statistically Significant

TABLE NO. 36: SEED PROJECT FIRST GRADE STUDENTS' MONTHLY ACHIEVEMENT RATE

SCHOOLS	N	POST-TEST MAY 1971 $\bar{x}$	ASSUMED ENTRANCE LEVEL	DIFFERENCE	MONTHS: N		MONTHLY ACHIEVEMENT RATE Y / X
					ACHIEVEMENT Y	INSTRUCTION X	
ALL SCHOOLS							
Boys	237	1.69	1	.69	6.90	6.5	1.06
Girls	233	1.84	1	.84	8.40	6.5	1.29
Boys and Girls	460	1.76	1	.76	7.60	6.5	1.17
ALL HALLOWS							
Boys	21	1.73	1	.73	7.30	6.5	1.23
Girls	27	1.79	1	.79	7.90	6.5	1.22
Boys and Girls	48	1.76	1	.76	7.60	6.5	1.17
BAYVIEW							
Boys	39	1.63	1	.63	6.30	6.5	.97
Girls	23	1.65	1	.65	6.50	6.5	1.00
Boys and Girls	62	1.64	1	.64	6.40	6.5	.98
BRET HARTE							
Boys	34	1.84	1	.84	8.40	6.5	1.29
Girls	46	2.11	1	1.11	11.10	6.5	1.71
Boys and Girls	80	1.99	1	.99	9.90	6.5	1.52

TABLE NO. 36: CONTINUED

SCHOOLS	N	POST-TEST MAY 1971 $\bar{x}$	ASSUMED ENTRANCE LEVEL	DIFFERENCE	MONTHS: N		MONTHLY ACHIEVEMENT RATE Y/X
					ACHIEVEMENT$_Y$	INSTRUCTION$_X$	
BURNETT							
Boys	41	1.99	1	.99	9.90	6.5	1.52
Girls	37	2.32	1	1.32	13.20	6.5	2.03
Boys and Girls	78	2.14	1	1.14	11.40	6.5	1.75
FREMONT							
Boys	9	1.52	1	.52	5.20	6.5	.80
Girls	11	1.57	1	.57	5.70	6.5	.88
Boys and Girls	20	1.55	1	.55	5.50	6.5	.85
HUNTERS POINT II							
Boys	9	1.73	1	.73	7.30	6.5	1.12
Girls	7	1.79	1	.79	7.90	6.5	1.22
Boys and Girls	16	1.76	1	.76	7.60	6.5	1.17
JEDEDIAH SMITH							
Boys	42	1.52	1	.52	5.20	6.5	.80
Girls	39	1.51	1	.51	5.10	6.5	.79
Boys and Girls	81	1.51	1	.51	5.10	6.5	.79

TABLE NO. 36: CONTINUED

SCHOOLS	N	POST-TEST MAY 1971 $\bar{x}$	ASSUMED ENTRANCE LEVEL	DIFFERENCE	MONTHS: N		MONTHLY ACHIEVEMENT RATE Y / X
					ACHIEVEMENT$_Y$	INSTRUCTION$_X$	
SIR FRANCIS DRAKE							
Boys	42	1.51	1	.51	5.10	6.5	.78
Girls	33	1.51	1	.51	5.10	6.5	.78
Boys and Girls	75	1.55	1	.55	5.50	6.5	.85

TABLE NO. 37: SEED PROJECT SECOND GRADE STUDENTS' MONTHLY ACHIEVEMENT RATE

SCHOOLS	N	PRE-TEST OCT. 1970 $\bar{x}$	N	POST-TEST MAY 1971 $\bar{x}$	DIFFERENCE	MONTHS: N		MONTHLY ACHIEVEMENT RATE Y / X
						ACHIEVEMENT$_Y$	INSTRUCTION$_X$	
ALL SCHOOLS								
Boys	197	1.54	234	2.28	.74	7.40	6.5	1.14
Girls	187	1.61	207	2.46	.85	8.50	6.5	1.31
Boys and Girls	384	1.57	441	2.36	.79	7.90	6.5	1.22
ALL HALLOWS								
Boys	22	1.89	20	2.56	.67	6.70	6.5	1.03
Girls	32	2.02	27	2.50	.48	4.80	6.5	.74
Boys and Girls	54	1.96	47	2.53	.57	5.70	6.5	.88
BAYVIEW								
Boys	21	1.52	26	1.90	.38	3.80	6.5	.58
Girls	24	1.59	25	2.46	.87	8.70	6.5	1.34
Boys and Girls	45	1.56	51	2.18	.62	6.20	6.5	.95
BRET HARTE								
Boys	12	1.32	41	2.21	.89	8.90	6.5	1.37
Girls	13	1.23	36	2.44	1.21	12.10	6.5	1.86
Boys and Girls	25	1.28	77	2.32	1.04	10.40	6.5	1.60

TABLE NO. 37: CONTINUED

SCHOOLS	N	PRE-TEST OCT. 1970 $\bar{x}$	N	POST-TEST MAY 1971 $\bar{x}$	DIFFERENCE	MONTHS: N		MONTHLY ACHIEVEMENT RATE Y / X
						ACHIEVEMENT$_Y$	INSTRUCTION$_X$	
BURNETT								
Boys	49	1.70	42	2.55	.85	8.50	6.5	1.31
Girls	26	1.76	23	2.84	1.08	10.80	6.5	1.66
Boys and Girls	75	1.72	65	2.65	.93	9.30	6.5	1.43
FREMONT								
Boys	8	1.55	20	2.26	.71	7.10	6.5	1.09
Girls	4	1.85	15	2.55	.70	7.00	6.5	1.07
Boys and Girls	12	1.65	35	2.39	.74	7.40	6.5	1.14
HUNTERS POINT II								
Boys	13	1.74	11	1.73	- .01	- .10	6.5	- .02
Girls	10	1.45	5	1.96	.51	5.10	6.5	.78
Boys and Girls	23	1.61	16	1.80	.19	1.90	6.5	.29
JEDEDIAH SMITH								
Boys	37	1.32	40	2.43	1.11	11.10	6.5	1.71
Girls	38	1.43	38	2.44	1.01	10.10	6.5	1.55
Boys and Girls	75	1.37	78	2.44	1.07	10.70	6.5	1.65

TABLE NO. 37: CONTINUED

SCHOOLS	N	PRE-TEST OCT. 1970 $\bar{x}$	N	POST-TEST MAY 1971 $\bar{x}$	DIFFERENCE	MONTHS: N		MONTHLY ACHIEVEMENT RATE Y / X
						ACHIEVEMENT$_Y$	INSTRUCTION$_X$	
SIR FRANCIS DRAKE								
Boys	8	1.21	34	2.19	.98	9.80	6.5	1.51
Girls	14	1.55	38	2.25	.70	7.00	6.5	1.08
Boys and Girls	22	1.43	72	2.22	.79	7.90	6.5	1.22

TABLE NO. 38: SEED PROJECT THIRD GRADE STUDENTS' MONTHLY ACHIEVEMENT RATE

SCHOOLS	N	PRE-TEST OCT.1970 $\bar{x}$	N	POST-TEST MAY 1971 $\bar{x}$	DIFFERENCE	MONTHS: N		MONTHLY ACHIEVEMENT RATE Y / X
						ACHIEVEMENT$_Y$	INSTRUCTION$_X$	
ALL SCHOOLS								
Boys	267	2.03	235	2.51	.48	4.80	6.5	.74
Girls	250	2.18	225	2.76	.58	5.80	6.5	.89
Boys and Girls	517	2.10	460	2.63	.53	5.30	6.5	.82
ALL HALLOWS								
Boys	30	2.33	10	3.55	1.22	12.20	6.5	1.88
Girls	35	2.57	22	3.65	1.08	10.80	6.5	1.66
Boys and Girls	65	2.46	32	3.62	1.16	11.60	6.5	1.78
BAYVIEW								
Boys	29	1.88	30	2.38	.50	5.00	6.5	.77
Girls	29	2.29	32	2.84	.55	5.50	6.5	.85
Boys and Girls	58	2.08	62	2.62	.54	5.40	6.5	.83
BRET HARTE								
Boys	46	2.08	48	2.53	.45	4.50	6.5	.69
Girls	41	2.05	37	2.55	.50	5.00	6.5	.77
Boys and Girls	87	2.07	85	2.54	.47	4.70	6.5	.72

TABLE NO. 38: CONTINUED

SCHOOLS	N	PRE-TEST OCT. 1970 $\bar{x}$	N	POST-TEST MAY 1971 $\bar{x}$	DIFFERENCE	MONTHS: N		MONTHLY ACHIEVEMENT RATE Y/X
						ACHIEVEMENT$_Y$	INSTRUCTION$_X$	
BURNETT								
Boys	31	2.35	27	2.75	.40	4.00	6.5	.62
Girls	44	2.32	39	2.79	.47	4.70	6.5	.72
Boys and Girls	75	2.33	66	2.78	.45	4.50	6.5	.69
FREMONT								
Boys	34	2.16	32	2.22	.06	.60	6.5	.09
Girls	22	2.30	24	2.60	.30	3.00	6.5	.46
Boys and Girls	56	2.21	56	2.38	.17	1.70	6.5	.26
HUNTERS POINT II								
Boys	16	1.63	6	2.33	.70	7.00	6.5	1.08
Girls	16	1.86	8	2.37	.51	5.10	6.5	.78
Boys and Girls	32	1.74	14	2.36	.62	6.20	6.5	.95
JEDEDIAH SMITH								
Boys	39	1.89	41	2.65	.76	7.60	6.5	1.17
Girls	26	2.03	28	2.85	.82	8.20	6.5	1.26
Boys and Girls	65	1.95	69	2.73	.78	7.80	6.5	1.20

TABLE NO. 38: CONTINUED

SCHOOLS	N	PRE-TEST OCT. 1970 $\bar{x}$	N	POST-TEST MAY 1971 $\bar{x}$	DIFFERENCE	MONTHS: N		MONTHLY ACHIEVEMENT RATE Y/X
						ACHIEVEMENT$_Y$	INSTRUCTION$_X$	
SIR FRANCIS DRAKE								
Boys	42	1.83	41	2.26	.43	4.30	6.5	.66
Girls	37	1.87	35	2.40	.53	5.30	6.5	.82
Boys and Girls	79	1.85	76	2.33	.48	4.80	6.5	.74

TABLE NO. 39: SEED PROJECT FIRST GRADE STUDENTS' NUMBER OF FULL DAYS IN PROGRAM: MANN-WHITNEY U TEST TO DETERMINE WHETHER BOYS AND GIRLS DIFFERED SIGNIFICANTLY WITH RESPECT TO ATTENDANCE

SCHOOLS	MANN-WHITNEY U STATISTIC	Z	SEX		CRITERION: a = .01 SIG/NSIG
			MALE	FEMALE	
ALL SCHOOLS	14168.00	-0.760	176	169	NSIG
ALL HALLOWS	71.00	*(46)	12	16	NSIG
BAYVIEW	211.50	-0.538	26	18	NSIG
BRET HARTE	139.50	-1.206	14	26	NSIG
BURNETT	299.00	-0.490	25	26	NSIG
FREMONT	31.00	*(13)	8	10	NSIG
HUNTERS POINT II		NO DATA AVAILABLE			
JEDEDIAH SMITH	949.50	-0.117	47	41	NSIG
SIR FRANCIS DRAKE	541.00	-1.716	44	32	NSIG

*Critical Value for N_2 (9-20) in Table K in, Sidney Siegel, Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1956), p. 274-275.

TABLE NO. 40: SEED PROJECT SECOND GRADE STUDENTS' NUMBER OF FULL DAYS IN PROGRAM: MANN-WHITNEY U TEST TO DETERMINE WHETHER BOYS AND GIRLS DIFFERED SIGNIFICANTLY WITH RESPECT TO ATTENDANCE

SCHOOLS	MANN-WHITNEY U STATISTIC	Z	SEX		CRITERION: a = .01 SIG/NSIG
			MALE	FEMALE	
ALL SCHOOLS	15915.00	-1.652	194	182	NSIG
ALL HALLOWS	312.50	-1.186	24	32	NSIG
BAYVIEW	323.00	-0.038	25	26	NSIG
BRET HARTE	118.00	*(66)	15	17	NSIG
BURNETT	411.50	-1.234	42	24	NSIG
FREMONT	118.00	-1.269	21	15	NSIG
HUNTERS POINT II	13.50	*(3)	9	4	NSIG
JEDEDIAH SMITH	420.50	-2.107	34	35	NSIG
SIR FRANCIS DRAKE	286.00	-1.109	24	29	NSIG

*Critical Value for N_2 (9-20) in Table K in, Sidney Siegel, Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1956), p. 274-275.

TABLE NO. 41: SEED PROJECT THIRD GRADE STUDENTS' NUMBER OF FULL DAYS IN PROGRAM: MANN-WHITNEY U TEST TO DETERMINE WHETHER BOYS AND GIRLS DIFFERED SIGNIFICANTLY WITH RESPECT TO ATTENDANCE

SCHOOLS	MANN-WHITNEY U STATISTIC	Z	SEX		CRITERION: a = .01 SIG/NSIG
			MALE	FEMALE	
ALL SCHOOLS	20680.00	-0.695	208	207	NSIG
ALL HALLOWS	237.50	-0.219	19	26	NSIG
BAYVIEW	535.50	-0.109	32	34	NSIG
BRET HARTE	568.00	-0.117	35	33	NSIG
BURNETT	438.00	-1.850	27	44	NSIG
FREMONT	366.50	-0.026	32	23	NSIG
HUNTERS POINT II	1.00	*(.057)	4	3	NSIG
JEDEDIAH SMITH	210.00	-0.657	28	17	NSIG
SIR FRANCIS DRAKE	364.00	-0.850	31	27	NSIG

*Critical Value for N_2 (4) in Table J in, Sidney Siegel, Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences (New York: NcGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1956), p. 271.

TABLE NO. 42: SEED PROJECT FIRST GRADE STUDENTS' READING ACHIEVEMENT STANINE SCORES: MANN-WHITNEY U TEST TO DETERMINE WHETHER BOYS AND GIRLS DIFFERED SIGNIFICANTLY WITH RESPECT TO STANINE SCORES

SCHOOLS	MANN-WHITNEY U STATISTIC	Z	SEX		CRITERION: a = .01 SIG/NSIG
			MALE	FEMALE	
ALL SCHOOLS	22423.00	-2.840	237	223	SIG
ALL HALLOWS	264.00	-0.413	21	27	NSIG
BAYVIEW	396.00	-0.780	39	23	NSIG
BRET HARTE	594.50	-1.842	34	46	NSIG
BURNETT	527.00	-2.348	41	37	SIG
FREMONT	41.50	*(18)	9	11	NSIG
HUNTERS POINT II	24.00	*(9)	9	7	NSIG
JEDEDIAH SMITH	800.50	-0.178	42	39	NSIG
SIR FRANCIS DRAKE	582.00	-1.215	42	33	NSIG

*Critical Value for N_2 (9-20) in Table K in, Sidney Siegel, Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1956), P. 274-275.

TABLE NO. 43: SEED PROJECT SECOND GRADE STUDENTS' READING ACHIEVEMENT STANINE SCORES: MANN-WHITNEY U TEST TO DETERMINE WHETHER BOYS AND GIRLS DIFFERED SIGNIFICANTLY WITH RESPECT TO STANINE SCORES

SCHOOLS	MANN-WHITNEY U STATISTIC	Z	SEX		CRITERION: a = .01 SIG/NSIG
			MALE	FEMALE	
ALL SCHOOLS	21997.00	-1.610	234	206	NSIG
ALL HALLOWS	239.00	-0.700	20	27	NSIG
BAYVIEW	230.00	-1.825	26	25	NSIG
BRET HARTE	629.00	-1.129	41	36	NSIG
BURNETT	382.50	-1.410	42	23	NSIG
FREMONT	111.00	-1.042	20	14	NSIG
HUNTERS POINT II	17.00	*(7)	11	5	NSIG
JEDEDIAH SMITH		NO DATA	AVAILABLE		
SIR FRANCIS DRAKE	603.50	-0.500	34	38	NSIG

*Critical Value for N_2 (9-20) in Table K in, Sidney Siegel, Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1956), p. 274-275.

TABLE NO. 44: SEED PROJECT THIRD GRADE STUDENTS' READING ACHIEVEMENT STANINE SCORES: MANN-WHITNEY U TEST TO DETERMINE WHETHER BOYS AND GIRLS DIFFERED SIGNIFICANTLY WITH RESPECT TO STANINE SCORES

SCHOOLS	MANN-WHITNEY U STATISTIC	Z	SEX		CRITERION: a = .01 SIG/NSIG
			MALE	FEMALE	
ALL SCHOOLS	20786.00	-4.084	235	225	SIG
ALL HALLOWS	83.00	-1.153	10	22	NSIG
BAYVIEW	345.50	-1.950	30	32	NSIG
BRET HARTE	775.50	1.039	48	37	NSIG
BURNETT	510.50	-0.213	27	39	NSIG
FREMONT	250.50	-2.351	32	24	SIG
HUNTERS POINT II	23.50	*(.475)	6	8	NSIG
JEDEDIAH SMITH	460.50	-1.427	41	28	NSIG
SIR FRANCIS DRAKE	571.00	-0.913	41	35	NSIG

*Critical Value for N_2 (8) in Table J in, Sidney Siegel, Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1956), p. 273.

TABLE NO. 45: A KRUSKAL-WALLIS H STATISTIC COMPARISON OF SEED FIRST GRADE STUDENTS' MEAN GRADE EQUIVALENT SCORES PER SCHOOL FOR ACADEMIC YEARS: 1969-1970 AND 1970-1971

SCHOOLS	1969-1970		1970-1971	
	MEAN GES	RANK	MEAN GES	RANK
ALL HALLOWS	1.57	5.5	1.76	12
BAYVIEW	1.57	5.5	1.64	8.5
BRET HARTE	1.76	12.	1.99	14.
BURNETT	2.12	15.	2.14	16.
FREMONT	1.64	8.5	1.55	3.5
HUNTERS POINT II	1.42	1.	1.76	12.
JEDEDIAH SMITH	1.74	10.	1.51	2.
SIR FRANCIS DRAKE	1.60	7.	1.55	3.5
TOTAL RANKS		64.50		71.5
RANKS SQUARED		4160.25		5112.25

$H = 166.18$ $H_o = X^2 = 6.64$ (1 df, a = .01)

Statistically Significant

TABLE NO. 46: A KRUSKAL-WALLIS H STATISTIC COMPARISON OF SEED SECOND GRADE STUDENTS' MEAN GRADE EQUIVALENT SCORES PER SCHOOL FOR ACADEMIC YEARS: 1969-1970 AND 1970-1971

SCHOOLS	1969-1970		1970-1971	
	MEAN GES	RANK	MEAN GES	RANK
ALL HALLOWS	2.15	6.	2.53	15.
BAYVIEW	2.03	5.	2.18	7.
BRET HARTE	2.40	12.5	2.32	9.
BURNETT	2.40	12.5	2.65	16.
FREMONT	2.34	10.	2.39	11.
HUNTERS POINT II	1.77	1.	1.80	2.
JEDEDIAH SMITH	1.96	4.	2.44	14.
SIR FRANCIS DRAKE	1.87	3.	2.22	8.
TOTAL RANKS		54.		82.
RANKS SQUARED		2916		6724

$H = 173.83$ $H_o = X^2 = 6.64$ (1 df, a = .01)

Statistically Significant

TABLE NO. 47: A KRUSKAL-WALLIS H STATISTIC COMPARISON OF SEED THIRD GRADE STUDENTS' MEAN GRADE EQUIVALENT SCORES PER SCHOOL FOR ACADEMIC YEARS: 1969-1970 AND 1970-1971

SCHOOLS	1969-1970		1970-1971	
	MEAN GES	RANK	MEAN GES	RANK
ALL HALLOWS	3.36	15.	3.62	16.
BAYVIEW	2.45	8.	2.62	11.
BRET HARTE	2.61	10.	2.54	9.
BURNETT	2.91	14.	2.78	13.
FREMONT	2.26	2.5	2.38	6.
HUNTERS POINT II	2.39	7.	2.36	5.
JEDEDIAH SMITH	2.23	1.	2.73	12.
SIR FRANCIS DRAKE	2.26	2.5	2.33	4.
TOTAL RANKS		60.		76.
RANKS SQUARED		3600		5776

$H = 168.33$ $H_o = X^2 = 6.64$ (1 df, a = .01)

Statistically Significant