DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 083 315 TM 003 307

AUTHOR Clark, Sara H.
TITLE Basic Skill Centers of Minneapolis, 1971-72.
INSTITUTION Minneapolis Public Schools, Minn. Dept. of Research and Evaluation.
REPORT NO C-71-25
PUB DATE Dec 72
NOTE 52p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Achievement Tests; Elementary Grades; Multimedia Instruction; Parent Attitudes; Program Evaluation; *Questionnaires; Reading Improvement; *Reading Tests; *Remedial Reading Programs; Student Attitudes; *Student Testing; Tables (Data); Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS *Basic Skill Centers; Gates MacGinitie Reading Tests; Minneapolis; Stanford Achievement Test

ABSTRACT

Two Basic Skill Centers were set up in Minneapolis in 1969 to help inner-city students improve their reading skills. This report covers the fourth year's operation of the project. The goals of the program include remediation of subskill weaknesses, achievement of functional reading levels, and raising the rate of reading growth of children in Target Area schools, who were one or more years below grade level in reading. Individualized instruction was provided for 675 students from grades 3-7, using a multimedia approach that included Talking Typewriters, Language Masters, Talking Pages, and other devices. The students make grade equivalent gains well above those expected, as measured by the Gates-MacGinitie and Stanford Primary Achievement tests. The test results are tabulated. Parent, teacher, and Student questionnaires, copies of which are provided, used to ascertain their attitudes towards the Basic Skill Centers. The answers obtained are tabulated. The centers were viewed very favorably by all three groups of respondents. (Author/DB)

Planning
Development
Federal Programs

MPS Educational Services

Minneapolis Public Schools

MINNEAPOLIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Special School District No. 1
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55413

ISC — PUBLICATIONS '72

Minneapolis Public Schools

Basic Skill Centers of Minneapolis 1971-72

This project was supported, in part, by Title I, ESEA funds.

Sara H. Clark, Title I Evaluator

Ideas expressed in this report do not necessarily reflect the official position of the Minneapolis Public School Administration nor the Minneapolis School Board.

Research and Evaluation Department
Educational Services Division
807 N.E. Broadway
Minneapolis, Minnesota 5541[illegible]

December 1972
C-71-25

Minneapolis Public Schools

Basic Skill Centers
1971-72

Summary

Two Basic Skill Centers, one on the near North Side, the other on the South Side, were set up in 1969 to help inner city students improve their reading skills. The Centers are supported for the most part by the Minneapolis Public Schools although ESEA Title I funds provide the teacher aides. This report covers the fourth year's operation of the project. 6

The goals of the program include remediation of sub-skill weaknesses, achievement of functional reading levels, and raising the rate of reading growth of children in Target Area schools who were one or more years below grade level in reading. 8

Individualized instruction was provided for 675 students from grades 3-7 using a multi-media approach which included Talking Typewriters, Language Masters, Talking Pages and other devices as well as a related classroom. 9

The students, who came from Title I Target Area schools, made grade equivalent gains well above what would have been expected for average children working at the reading levels of the Gates-MacGinitie and Stanford Primary Achievement tests which were the measuring instruments. 25

Recommendations include continuing the project. 37

***

December 1972 Research and Evaluation Department

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Appendix Tables

Acknowledgments

A number of persons have contributed, either directly or indirectly, to this report. The cooperation of the staff at both Centers was greatly appreciated. I especially wish to thank Mary C. Kasbohm, the project director, for defining the objectives of the Basic Skill Centers and for describing the new developments in their program in the section on Project Operations.

The City of Minneapolis

The program described in this report was conducted in the Minneapolis Public Schools. Minneapolis is a city of 434,400 people located on the Mississippi River in the southeastern part of Minnesota. With its somewhat smaller twin city, St. Paul, it is the center of a seven county metropolitan area of over 1,874,000, the largest population center between Chicago and the Pacific Coast. As such it serves as the hub for the entire Upper Midwest region of the country.

The city, and its surrounding area, long has been noted for the high quality of its labor force. The unemployment rate in Minneapolis is lower than in other major cities, possibly due to the variety and density of industry in the city as well as to the high level capability of its work force. The unemployment rate in May of 1972 was 4.1%, compared with a 5.9% national rate for the same month. As the economic center of a prosperous region rich in such natural resources as forests, minerals, water power and productive agricultural land, Minneapolis attracts commerce and workers from throughout the Upper Midwest region. Many residents are drawn from the neighboring states of Iowa, Wisconsin, Nebraska and the Dakotas as well as from the farming areas and the Iron Range region of outstate Minnesota.

More Minneapolitans (32%) work in clerical and sales jobs than in any other occupation, reflecting the city's position as a major wholesale-retail center and a center for banking, finance and insurance. Almost as many (26%) are employed as craftsmen, foremen and operatives, and 23% of the work force are professionals, technicians, managers, and officials. One out of five workers is employed in laboring and service occupations.

Minneapolis city government is the council-dominated type. Its mayor, elected for a two year term has limited powers. Its elected city council operates by committee and engages in administrative as well as legislative action.

Minneapolis is not a crowded city. While increasing industrial development has occupied more and more land, the city's population has declined steadily from a peak of 522,000 in 1950. The city limits have not been changed since 1927. Most homes are sturdy, single family dwellings built to withstand severe winters. Row homes are practically non-existant even in low income areas. In 1970, 48% of the housing units in Minneapolis

were owner-occupied.

Most Minneapolitans are native born Americans, but about 35,000 (7%) are foreign born. Swedes, Norwegians, Germans, and Canadians comprise most of the foreign born population.

Relatively few non-white citizens live in Minneapolis although their numbers are increasing. In 1960 only three percent of the population was non-white. The 1970 census figures indicate that the non-white population has more than doubled (6.4%) in the intervening 10 years. About 70% of the non-whites are black. Most of the remaining non-white population is Indian-American, mainly Chippewa and Sioux. Only a small number of residents from Spanish-speaking or Oriental origins live in the city. In 1970 non-white residents made up 6.4% of the city's population but accounted for 15% of the children in the city's elementary schools.

Minneapolis has not reached the stage of many other large cities in terms of the level of social problems. It has been relatively untouched by racial disorders or by student unrest. Crime rates are below national averages. Continuing concern over law and order, however, is still evidenced by the recent re-election of Mayor Charles Stenvig, a former police detective.

One's first impression is that Minneapolis doesn't really have serious problems of blight and decay. But the signs of trouble are evident to one who looks beyond the parks and lakes and tree-lined streets. As with many other larger cities, the problems are focused in the core city and are related to increasing concentrations there of the poor, many of them non-whites, and of the elderly. For example, nine out of 10 black Americans in Minneapolis live in just one-tenth of the city's area. While Minneapolis contains 11% of the state's population, it supports 28% of the state's AFDC families.

There has been a steady migration to the city by Indian Americans from the reservations and by poor whites from the small towns and rural areas of Minnesota. They come to the "promised land" of Minneapolis looking for a job and a better way of life. Some make it; many do not. The Indian American population is generally confined to the same small geographic areas in which black Americans live. These same areas of the city have the lowest median incomes in the city and the highest concentrations of dilapidated housing, welfare cases, and juvenile delinquency.

The elderly also are concentrated in the central city. In 1970, 15% of the city's population was over age 65. The elderly, like the 18 to 24 year old young adults, live near the central city because of the availability of

less expensive housing in multiple-unit dwellings. Younger families have continued to migrate toward the outer edges of the city and to the surrounding suburban areas.

The Minneapolis Schools

About 69,477 children go to school in Minneapolis. Most of them, about 61,052 attend one of the city's 98 public schools; 8,425 attend parochial or private schools.

The Minneapolis Public Schools, headed by Dr. John B. Davis, Jr., who became superintendent in 1967, consists of 67 elementary schools (kindergarten-6th grade), 15 junior high schools (grades 7-9), nine high schools (grades 10-12), two junior-senior high schools, and five special schools. Nearly 3,500 certificated personnel are employed.

Control of the public school system ultimately rests with a seven member board which levies its own taxes and sells its own bonds. These non-salaried officials are elected by popular votes for staggered six year terms. The superintendent is selected by the board and serves as its executive officer and professional adviser.

Almost 40 cents of each local property tax dollar goes to support a school system whose annual operating general fund budget in 1972-73 is $78,992,236 up from $74,340,271 in 1971-72. Minneapolis received federal funds totaling 8 million dollars in 1971-72 from many different federal aid programs. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act provided about 6.8 million dollars, of which 3.4 million dollars were from Title I funds. Per pupil costs in the system were $920 in 1970-71 while the range of per pupil costs in the state was from $254 to $1,041.

One of the superintendent's goals has been to achieve greater communication among the system's schools through decentralization. Consequently two "pyramids" or groups of geographically related schools have been formed. First to be formed, in 1967, was the North Pyramid, consisting of North High School and the elementary and junior high schools which feed into it. In 1969 the South-Central Pyramid was formed around South and Central High Schools. Each pyramid has an area assistant superintendent as well as advisory groups of principals, teachers, and parents. The goals of the pyramid structure are to effect greater communication among schools and between schools and the community, to develop collaborative and cooperative programs, and to share particular facilities and competencies of teachers.

Based on sight counts on October 17, 1972 the percentage of black American pupils for the school district was 10.6%. Eight years before, the proportion was 5.4%. Indian American children currently comprise 3.8% of the school population, more than double the proportion of eight years ago. The proportion of minority children in the various elementary schools generally reflects the prevailing housing pattern found in each school area. Although some non-white pupils are enrolled in every elementary school, non-white pupils are concentrated in two relatively small areas of the city. Of the 67 elementary schools, 11 have more than 30% non-white enrollment and four of these have over 50%. There are no all-black nor all-white schools. Twenty-three elementary schools have non-white enrollments of less than 5%.

The Minneapolis School Board has approved a plan which would desegregate the city's schools in September 1973.

The proportion of school age children in AFDC homes has more than doubled from approximately 12% in 1962 to 28% in 1972.

While the median pupil turnover rate for all the city schools in 1970-71 was about 23%, this figure varied widely according to location (turnover rate is the percentage of students that comes new to the school or leaves the school at some time during the school year, using the September enrollment as a base figure). Target area schools generally experience a much higher turnover rate; in fact only two of the target area schools had turnover rates less than the city median. Compared with the city, the median for the target area schools was almost twice as large (39%).

The Target Area

The Target Area is a portion of the core city of Minneapolis where the schools are eligible to receive benefits from programs funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). A school is eligible to receive Title I aid if the percentage of families residing in that school's district which receives AFDC payments (in excess of $2,000 a year)-or has an annual income under $2,000-exceeds the citywide percentage for families in those categories.

In 1972-73, nearly 26,871 children attended the 24 elementary schools, five junior highs, three senior highs and seven parochial schools that were eligible to receive this aid. One-third of these students were from minority groups and one-third were defined by the State Department of Education as educationally disadvantaged, i.e. one or more grade levels behind in basic skills such as reading and arithmetic. Federal programs are concentrated on the educationally disadvantaged group.

According to 1970 census data, over 170,000 persons resided in the Target Area. Of that group, 11 percent were black and 3½ percent were Indian, more than double the citywide percentage of minority group members. Over half of the Target Area residents over 25 years old had not completed high school, compared to the 35 percent of the non-Target Area residents who did not have high school diplomas. One out of five Target Area residents over the age of 25 had gone to college, and nine percent had completed four or more years. One out of four of the non-Target Area residents had gone to college, and 15 percent had completed four or more years.

The income for an average Target Area family was $9,113 in 1970, over $2,000 less than the citywide average. The homes they lived in had an average value of $10,385, over 40 percent less than the average value of a single family residence in Minneapolis. One out of five Target Area children between the ages of 6 and 17 was a member of a family that is below the proverty level, while only 6 percent of the non-Target Area children had such a family status.

Historical Background

The Minneapolis Public Schools' Basic Skill Centers (BSC) have been operating since the summer of 1968. The BSC program was developed to help students learn to read. It is aimed at the students from inner-city Target Area schools whose reading is most severely retarded.

There are two Basic Skill Centers; one on the near North Side, the other on the South Side. The Centers have been supported mostly with local funds although most of the teaching aides have been paid with ESEA Title I funds. Each year about 700 students, the majority in grades four through six, have participated in the BSC program.

One major aspect of the original BSC operation was the extensive use of Talking Typewriters. From 1968 to 1970 each student spent 20 minutes a day using these computerized teaching machines and 20 minutes in an adjacent classroom where he received additional instruction from teachers and aides.

In 1970-71 the Centers' program -- hardware, software and students served -- was changed substantially. A multimedia room was developed where students worked with tabletop Talking Pages, listening tables, overhead projectors and, in some cases, with Dorsett teaching machines. Students spent equal amounts of time in the multimedia room, on the Talking Typewriters and in the related classrooms, using two of these three facilities each day. New software for the Talking Typewriters and other teaching machines, and new support materials for the Centers' classrooms were developed by personnel from the Minneapolis Public Schools. Related materials for the home school classrooms, to be used on a

volunteer basis, also were prepared. From 1970 on, only the children determined by their teachers and by tests to be the most severely retarded in reading participated in the program.

In 1970-71, after program changes were instituted, year-end results showed substantial gains in reading progress for BSC students compared with their reading growth in previous years. A more detailed history of the project, as well as evaluations of previous years, is available.[1]

---

[1]Basic Skill Centers Evaluation, September 1969 - June 1971. Minneapolis Public Schools, Research and Evaluation Department, 807 N. E. Broadway, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55413
Report No. C-70-12

Objectives

The general goals of this program include remediation of sub-skill weaknesses, achievement of functional reading levels, and raising the rate of reading growth of children in Target Area schools who were one or more years below grade level in reading in September 1971.

More specific goals include the following:

1. To combine use of context clues with recognition of initial consonants. Implied:
   a. Inclusion of words in listening, thinking, speaking vocabulary.
   b. Letter knowledge in both upper and lower case
      (1) consonant phoneme-grapheme relationships
      (2) short vowel phoneme-grapheme relationships
2. To combine use of context clues with recognition of linguistic patterns or visual analysis clues.
   a. consonant blends and digraphs
   b. phonograms and diphthongs, most common syllable-patterns
   c. reading in thought units, or phrasing
   d. most common inflected endings: s, ed, ing
   e. compound words
   f. roots and affixes: ly, er, est, y, prefixes, etc.: (regular)
   g. phonetically irregular beginnings and endings and affixes with root changes
   h. syllabication, with pattern emphasis rather than rule emphasis
3. To comprehend sentences and paragraphs.

A measurable objective was to raise the reading achievement of the children as measured by standardized tests. A gain of one month or more in grade equivalents for each month of attendance at the Centers by at least 50% of the students would be considered as attainment of that objective.

Project Operations

There were two Basic Skill Centers. The South Center operated in the basement of an insurance company at 2500 Park Avenue South. The North Center was situated in a nonschool building purchased by the School Board. Its address was 1306 Plymouth Avenue North. Both Centers were air conditioned, partly because the Talking Typewriters will not operate above a given temperature and also to provide an improved learning environment for the children.

Ten Talking Typewriters were housed in 4'x 6' booths at each Center. One additional machine at the South Center was used for the development of new programs. Within the soundproof booth the learner was faced with two visual systems and two audio systems. Responses were made by typing and speaking. When the learner typed, his printed response was visible on the Typewriter paper. Spoken responses could be recorded and then played back with the student's words compared to a model recording.

Outside each booth was a control panel. This monitoring equipment included a telephone intercom hook-up through which the booth attendant could listen or talk to the student. An instrument control panel could be adjusted by the attendant, under the advice of the teacher, to control and tabulate the responses of the student.

When a child first went to the Talking Typewriter, it was set so he could explore the keyboard freely. Whenever a key was struck, the Typewriter typed the letter and pronounced the name of the letter. At the end

of every line the Typewriter carriage returned automatically. The keyboard was color-coded to assist beginners in locating letters. In the programmed phase, all incorrect keys were blocked; therefore, only the correct response could be made. The student experienced success continuously at his own rate of learning.

Each Center also had two classrooms where the students worked on their individual programs with assistance of a teacher and aides. In the classroom there were five aides for ten children; in the laboratory one aide was assigned to every two machines.

Further reinforcement of reading skills presented by the programs was made through the use of other teaching machines. The Talking Page consisted of a series of booklets and records which presented phonic principles of beginning reading. It was used for only selected skills which correlated with the new reading program in 1971-72. The Language Master was a machine through which cards with pictures, words, or short phrases and sentences were run. Each card had a two-track tape on it. The first track had the teacher's presentation of a word or phrase on it. The student's response was recorded on the second track. The student then compared the two tracks and, if necessary, repeated his response. Since both tracks were erasable the cards could be reused. The Center staff could construct new cards with pertinent or remedial material when needed.

In the 1970-71 school year, multimedia rooms were set up to house the Talking Pages, Language Masters, record players, overhead projectors, and listening tables. Three Dorsett machines, with the Dorsett software,

were added to provide experience transitional to the schools' developmental programs. Five aides worked with ten children at a time in this room under the supervision of the certificated staff.

During 1971-72 the "enrichment programs" which had been developed in previous years, and programs purchased from Dorsett Educational Systems, Inc., the Reading Attainment System, and other commercial sources, were used at the later transitional levels to prepare children to return to the home school developmental program.

The Sullivan Reading course, published by the Behavioral Reading Laboratory, formed the core of the original project. Since a change in administration occurred near the middle of the school year 1970-71, and the children at the Centers were using the Sullivan vocabulary then, the Sullivan course was made the point of departure for the new Basic Skill Centers Reading Program which is still in the process of development.

A phonetically-regular one-syllable vocabulary, like Sullivan's, still formed a major part of the instructional vocabulary for what were the old Books 1, 2 and 3 levels. However, the rationale and instructional approach and techniques were changed, even at those levels; sight words selected from frequency lists related to children's reading materials were added; the sequence of skills introduction was altered -- with ever increasing acceleration of change above the old Book 3 level; additional skills were taught; much greater emphasis was given to phrase reading and to comprehension.

The reading program was changing toward one based on a philosophy that effective word attack in reading consists of simultaneous utiliz-

ation of context clues and recognition of the largest usable visual patterns in words.

During the year 1971-72 the introductory program formerly used at the South Center was temporarily adopted for use at both Centers.

At the same time the development of a program of encoded filmstrip-cassette lessons programmed for a teaching machine with three pupil-response buttons was begun. This began at the level of visual discrimination of lower- and upper-case letter forms, well below the former Sullivan levels, and was a greater departure from Sullivan toward the philosophy of the administrator.

However, because of mechanical difficulties encountered in photography, recording and encoding phases of production, none of these lessons was available for use by children during the period covered by this report.

As a result, the Sullivan materials were retained to be used as only one source in a continuum of experiences from which a teacher prescribed for individual pupil needs. Some children learned a variety of skills without using a Sullivan book; others used a few pages of each book selected to reinforce some specific skills; still others -- usually those making slower progress - - went through entire Sullivan books even beyond Book 3.

The new software developed during the last half of the 1970-71 school year continued to be used with the Talking Typewriters, Language Masters, over-head projectors and other mechanical devices. The materials which had been developed for home school use again were distributed, and teachers from the home schools were brought to the Centers for one visit during their pupils' reading period at the Center.

Thirty students per period at each Center were scheduled so that during any given week their time was divided equally among the classroom, multimedia room, and Talking Typewriter laboratory. Over a month's time the students averaged 13 minutes a day at each of the stations though on any given day they spent 20 minutes at each of two stations. There were nine periods each school day except Tuesday when afternoon classes were not held.

Each student received individual assistance every day from his teacher, or aide, who discussed his progress with him. He kept a record of his test scores and took home a "type-out" which showed the work he had done each day he worked on the Talking Typewriter.

An incentive program was implemented in the second semester at the North Center whereby students were given inexpensive toys upon completion of certain levels of the program with 100% mastery.

Personnel

The staff, both professional and paraprofessional, at the Centers were well qualified to carry out their respective duties.

The four teachers were remedial reading specialists. Two of the teachers have worked in the project since its inception. All the teachers had special training in the use of the programs and the related materials.

Thirty-six teacher aides, 28 of whom were full-time, worked with the students under supervision of the teachers in the classrooms, multimedia rooms and in the Talking Typewriter labs. One additional aide worked full time as a technician in the production of cassettes and related film-strips for programs which had been developed by the professional staff. Sixteen of these aides had been with the program since it began. They all received special training in their work and attended inservice sessions whenever new materials or methods were introduced.

There was a clerk at each of the Centers who, in addition to fulfilling the usual clerical requirements, assisted in the production of materials.

A full-time project administrator, who was also a remedial reading specialist and a former teacher in the project, attended to the daily administrative and mechanical problems involved in running a project which included students from 24 different schools using a variety of teaching machines.

He reported to the assistant director of Planning, Development and Federal Programs who was the administrator of the project, responsible for all aspects of its operation. She also was a reading specialist and a former supervisor-instructor of the elementary reading clinic at the University of Minnesota for several years. The administrator inaugurated the development of some stages of a new Basic Skill Centers' Reading Program in December 1970, and inaugurated the development of the entire new structure, complete with programmed encoded filmstrip-cassette lessons, in January, 1972. At that

time, three part-time teachers on leave joined the staff as writers for the new sequences. Two part-time artists were also added to work on the programmed encoded filmstrip-with-cassette system being developed for a three-button-response type of machine such as that manufactured by the Dorsett Educational Systems, Inc.

No supplemental services were received from persons other than the staff listed above during the period covered by this report.

Planning and Training

The professional staff at the Basic Skill Centers has continuously planned changes to improve the program. Weekly meetings were held with the Administrator on Tuesday released time, a time scheduled in all Minneapolis schools for faculty training. Additional staff members were added, as noted in the section on personnel, to assist with development of new materials.

A full day inservice session was conducted for the aides before school began in the fall to acquaint them with new methods.

Classroom teachers and aides from the home schools participated in one after-school session at which follow-up materials for the BSC reading program were presented, explained and demonstrated.

The Project Schools

Sixteen elementary and three junior high schools participated in the program. Five other schools each sent one or two students. Except for three of the schools which sent only one or two students, all schools were located in the inner-city Target Area. Of the participating schools, all but two had higher mobility rates than the average for the city. According to 1970 census data the areas in which 15 of the 19 schools were located had fewer children living with both parents than the 79% city average. Forty-four percent of the elementary students in the schools involved came from AFDC families compared with 27% for the city. The three junior high schools also were well above the city's average in the percentages of students who came from AFDC families. The census data showed that 14 of the 19 schools were in areas which had more families below the poverty level than was average for Minneapolis. Fewer adults had completed high school than was average for the city in the areas in which 17 of the 19 schools were located. The majority of the schools had large minority enrollments though five of them had 10% or less minority students.

The distribution of students by schools in which they were enrolled is shown in Table 1.

Table 1

Numbers of Students from Participating Schools
1971-72

School	Students with Complete Data (Evaluation Group)	Students with Incomplete Data	Total Number
North Center			
Bremer	28	5	33
Hall	24	9	33
Harrison	33	5	38
Hawthorne	26	5	31
Lind	1	1	2
Lowell	34	11	45
Prescott	9		9
Sheridan Elem.	20	11	31
Willard	32	9	41
Franklin	21	11	32
Jordan	32	9	41
Olson	1		1
Lincoln Learning Center		1	1
St. Austin	1		1
Totals North	262	77	339
South Center			
Adams	25	8	33
Bancroft	33	4	37
Corcoran	26	5	31
Irving	27	13	40
Lyndale	27	22	49
Madison	20	10	30
Seward	30	2	32
Whittier	26	10	36
Phillips	25	22	47
South High		1	1
Totals South	239	97	336
Grand Totals	501	174	675

Student Participants

The majority of the 675 students who were enrolled, even briefly, at the Basic Skill Centers during the 1971-72 school year were in either the fourth or fifth grades. Most of the junior high students were seventh graders. Table 2 gives distributions by grade and Center for the 501 pupils for whom both pre- and posttests were available. They were the group on which the evaluation was based. The grade levels of those with incomplete test results are also given.

Overall, the boys outnumbered the girls by two to one. One third of the students had attended the Centers previous to their enrollment this year. They had been encouraged to complete the program.

The students were selected for the program by a dual screening. First, each participating school was asked to identify 40 of its lowest readers as candidates for assistance. The BSC teachers then gave each child an individual oral placement examination. Using the results of this test the 30 children most in need of the training provided at the Centers were selected. This examination was also used to place the children at the appropriate entry levels in the program.

The youngsters selected for the program were indeed eligible for the Title I assistance provided by the aides as well as for the individualized instruction which the Minneapolis Schools provided. Not only were they from areas of the city which were depressed in terms of socio-economic status, but many of them also had other difficulties which had caused

learning problems. Information obtained for 435 students showed that 63% of them fell in one or more of the following categories: (a) Lorge-Thorndike score at or below the 10th percentile, (b) IQ of 80 or below as measured by the Binet or WISC tests, (c) had been in, or recommended for, a class for the mentally retarded, or (d) had been in, or recommended for, Special Learning Behavior Problem classes.

Table 2

Distribution by Grade Level
of BSC Participants
1971-72

	Students with Complete Data (Evaluation Group)		Students with Incomplete Data	Total
Grade	North Center N	South Center N	N	N
3	1	24	16	41
4	131	68	53	252
5	50	68	36	154
6	26	51	24	101
7	45	23	38	106
8	6	2	5	13
9	3			3
Not Known		3	2	5
Totals	262	239	174	675

Parent-Community Involvement

In a reading program such as this there is little room for active parent or community involvement. The program was designed and administered by professionals who had had special training in the area. Each of the Centers held open house in the fall to which all of the parents and many community leaders were invited. The turn-out for these events was less than hoped for, but could be considered good in terms of the usual parent involvement in the PTA's of the participating schools.

A questionnaire was sent to all parents of students on roll in the Spring of 1972. Responses were received from about a quarter of the parents. They were representative of all parents in that the distributions by sex and grade of their children were similar to those of all students at the Centers, but the possible biases of the non-respondents cannot be estimated.

The responses were very favorable to the Basic Skill Centers' program. Over 80% of the parents thought that their children were reading better than before they attended the BSC, that the program had helped the children in other school work, that they enjoyed going to the Centers, and that money should continue to be spent on the BSC program rather than some other educational endeavor. Ninety-three percent of the parents agreed that their children should have been in the program. Although comments had been solicited on all questions, when asked "What other comments do you have about the Basic Skill Center?" 44 favorable remarks were

made compared with only 5 unfavorable ones. In spite of these favorable responses only 70% of the parents had visited the Centers during the year although 76% expressed interest in having the Centers hold open house again the following year. Table 1A, in the Appendix gives a tabulation, by Center, of responses to all questions asked.

Dissemination and Communication

A rather technical report describing and evaluating the Basic Skill Centers project from September 1969 through June 1971 was made available to the public (see Footnote 1, page 7). Since 1971-72 was the fourth year of the program's operation there was less publicity than previously in the general news media. There was, however, much closer communication with personnel from the participating schools than had existed previously.

At the beginning of the school year, charts showing the entry level of each of their students were sent to all participating home school teachers and principals. These were then up-dated throughout the school year every two weeks to provide information on the progress of the individual students.

In addition, arrangements were made so that the home school classroom teachers who sent pupils to the BSC could accompany their students to observe not only the program but also their students' performance and

reactions. Each teacher made one such visit.

A large variety of followup materials developed at the Centers was distributed to the home schools to be used for individual reinforcement at the different levels at which the children were working at the BSC. Instruction in the use of these materials was given to classroom teachers and aides at a two-hour after school paid inservice session. As new supplements were developed and delivered to the schools the project administrator explained their use.

In order that two-way communication might exist, the home school teachers were asked to respond to a number of questions concerning the Centers and their students who attended. Discussion of their replies is given in the next section.

Teacher Questionnaire

An information and opinion questionnaire was sent to each elementary teacher who had pupils attending the Centers. Because of the different type of class organization which existed at the junior high level none was sent to those teachers. Responses were received from 78 teachers or about 90% of those who were sent the questionnaire. The number of students from each teacher's class who attended the Centers ranged from 1 to 15 with a total of 350 students.

Two-thirds of the teachers said that they worked with their classes on

Reading and Language Arts during the time the BSC students were at the Centers. However, 89% of the same teachers said that their BSC students participated regularly in Language Arts periods at their home schools. Two-thirds of the respondents used the BSC's followup materials and suggestions during Language Arts periods for the BSC children and one in six said they also used them for other children in their schools.

Almost all teachers (87%) thought that those children who attended the Center were the ones most in need of special help in reading though only 67% had participated in their selection. If they were given children of the same achievment level as the present BSC students in another year, 86% said they would want them to participate in the Centers' program. Two-thirds of those who had previously had students attend the BSC thought that the 1971-72 program had improved over other years.

Concerning their students' reading habits and abilities, 63% of the teachers thought their pupils were reading more while 90% thought they were reading better. Of those noting such changes, 62 out of 64 thought the improvement could be attributed to the BSC program. These opinions were comparable to those given by parents who were asked similar questions.

Tabulation of responses to the questionnaire are presented in Table 2A in the Appendix.

Student Measures

The comprehension section of the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test was used

for both pre- and posttesting. Primary B (designed for second grade), Form 2, was used for the grades 3-5 and Primary C (designed for third grade), Form 2, was used for grades 6 and above. These were not the tests designated for the grade levels in which the children were enrolled, but they more nearly matched the actual reading levels of the students who had averaged, depending on grade, from 1.0 to 3.3 years below grade level on their last city-wide testing.

According to the publisher,

> The Comprehension test measures the child's ability to read and understand whole sentences and paragraphs. This ability includes many skills not involved in the mere ability to recognize words. The child must grasp the total thought if he is to answer correctly.

Although children entered and left the program at various times during the year, every effort was made to ensure that they received both pre- and post-tests. The minimum time span between testing was 6 weeks though the mean span was 6 months.

The word study skills section of the Stanford Achievement Reading Test had been selected to measure gains in skills that were being taught in new programs which were being developed. According to the publisher, the Primary I level,

> Tests auditory perception of beginning and ending sounds, phonics, and phonograms.

The Primary II level tests,

> Auditory perception of beginning and ending sounds and visual phonics.

Although the specific new materials were not introduced before the end of the 1971-72 school year, pre- posttest scores were obtained. Gains on this test are reported more for informative than evaluative purposes.

The Basic Skill Centers served 675 students from September 1971 to June 1972. Gain scores on the Gates-MacGinitie were obtained for three-fourths of these students. The remaining fourth included those who entered the program so late in the year that they were not pretested and those who left for various reasons before they were posttested. Of those with incomplete test data, about half moved out of the schools being served.

A brief student questionnaire concerning attitudes was administered to a random sample comprising about two-thirds of those enrolled in February, 1972.

Results

The Gates-MacGinitie testing showed the project more than achieved its objective that at least 50% of the students make a gain of one month or more in grade equivalents (G.E.) for each month of attendance at the Centers. In fact, 67% of the students gained 6 or more G.E. months in the average of a little over 6 months of instruction. These findings are based on the 501 students who took both the pre- and posttests.

The average number of days present is taken as the length of instruction for several reasons. The program was individualized so if a student were ab-

sent he did not fall behind the class but continued at his own rate. Also, because of the individualization, students could enter or leave the program at any time. Of the 501 students upon whom this evaluation is based, 177 or 35% either entered late or left early. The percentages of those in the evaluation group who entered late, left early, or both ranged from 11% to 66% for the different schools. A separate distribution of gain scores for those who were on roll for the entire year showed that 67% of the students had gained a month or more in grade equivalents for each month of the eight month pre-posttest span. Since these results were identical to those based on the average number of days present, which included those with shorter pre- post-test spans, the procedure seemed valid and allowed the inclusion of more students in the evaluation.

The median grade equivalent gain in comprehension on the Gates for those in fifth grade or below was +1.0. The median for the older students was +1.1. Their rate of gain was greater than that of the younger students since their average attendance was for a shorter length of time, .56 school year compared with .63 of the year for the younger students. These results are shown for all students in Table 3. Tables 4 and 5 show the gain scores for the younger students who were tested with Form B and for the older ones on Form C. The older students had entered the program at a higher level than had the younger ones. Forty-five percent of those at or below fifth grade had started with the introductory materials in the program, whereas only 19% of the older students had begun at that level.

The subtest on word study skills of the Stanford Achievement Test, Levels

Primary I and Primary II, had been selected in the fall of 1971 to measure growth in subskills which were to be taught from new filmstrip-cassette materials being developed at the Centers. Although the use of these materials was not implemented by June 1972, some revised introductory materials had been added to the program. Pre- and posttest measures were obtained for 494 students. Sixty-five percent of the fifth grade or younger students had made grade equivalent gains of at least a month for each month of instruction whereas 55% of the older students had made such gains. The younger students had gained at a greater rate for the length of instruction than had their older counterparts. Distributions are presented in Tables 6 and 7.

The use of the entrance and exit levels in the Sullivan programmed materials gives only a rough idea of the continuous progress of the children in the curriculum since many revisions and new introductory programs had been developed by the Centers' staff. While 54% of the pupils had started at Level 1 or below (37% in the introductory level) only 2% were at that level when they left the program. The median Sullivan level at exit was Level 7. (Table 8)

Pearson correlations were run among the following variables: Number of days present, number of Sullivan levels completed, and grade equivalent gains on both the Gates and Stanford subtests. The correlations, all of which were found to be significantly different from zero at the .01 level with an N of about 500, are presented in Table 9. However, the correlations are of little practical significance since they account for such a small portion of the variance.

Table 3

Grade Equivalent Gains Distributions
Gates-MacGinitie Comprehension Test
Total Evaluation Group
1971-72

Grade Equivalent Gains	N	Percent	Cumulative Percent
+3.0 or more	7	1.4	1.4
+2.5 to +2.9	28	5.6	7.0
+2.0 to +2.4	62	12.4	19.4
+1.5 to +1.9	75	14.9	34.3
+1.0 to +1.4	92	18.4	52.7
+ .9	32	6.4	59.1
+ .8	11	2.2	61.3
+ .7	15	3.0	64.3
+ .6	15	3.0	67.3
+ .5	17	3.4	70.7
+ .4	15	3.0	73.7
+ .3	23	4.5	78.2
+ .2	24	4.8	83.0
+ .1	16	3.2	86.2
0	22	4.4	90.6
- .1 to - .5	33	6.6	97.2
- .6 or less	14	2.8	100.0
Total	501	100.0%	

Median G.E. Gain +1.02

Mean Attendance
110 days or .61 school year

67% of the students gained 6 or more months in the average of 6 months of instruction.

Table 4

Grade Equivalent Gains Distribution
Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test, Level B
Comprehension
1971-72

Grade Equivalent Gains	N	Percent	Cumulative Percent
+3.0 or more	4	1.2	1.2
+2.5 to +2.9	15	4.3	5.5
+2.0 to +2.4	44	12.7	18.2
+1.5 to +1.9	52	15.0	33.2
+1.0 to +1.4	66	19.1	52.3
+ .9	18	5.2	57.5
+ .8	8	2.3	59.8
+ .7	13	3.8	63.6
+ .6	12	3.5	67.1
+ .5	14	4.0	71.1
+ .4	8	2.3	73.4
+ .3	13	3.8	77.2
+ .2	18	5.2	82.4
+ .1	12	3.5	85.9
0	14	4.0	89.9
- .1 to - .5	23	6.6	96.5
- .6 or less	12	3.5	100.0
Total	346	100.0%	

Median G.E. Gain +1.01

Mean Attendance
113 days or .63 school year

67% of the students gained 6 or more months in the average of a little over 6 months of instruction.

Table 5

Grade Equivalent Gains Distribution
Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test, Level C
Comprehension
1971-72

Grade Equivalent Gains	N	Percent	Cumulative Percent
+3.0 or more	3	1.9	1.9
+2.5 to +2.9	13	8.4	10.3
+2.0 to +2.4	18	11.6	21.9
+1.5 to +1.9	23	14.8	36.7
+1.0 to +1.4	26	16.8	53.5
+ .9	14	9.0	62.5
+ .8	3	1.9	64.4
+ .7	2	1.3	65.7
+ .6	3	1.9	67.6
+ .5	3	1.9	69.5
+ .4	7	4.5	74.0
+ .3	10	6.5	80.5
+ .2	6	3.9	84.4
+ .1	4	2.6	87.0
0	8	5.2	92.2
- .1 to - .5	10	6.5	98.7
- .6 or less	2	1.3	100.0
Total	155	100.0%	

Median G.E. Gain +1.06

Mean Attendance
102 days or .56 school year

68% of the students gained
6 or more months in the
average of a little less
than 6 months of instruction.

Table 6

Grade Equivalent Gains Distribution
Stanford Achievement Test, Primary I
Word Study Skills
1971-72

Grade Equivalent Gains	N	Percent	Cumulative Percent
+3.0 or more	27	7.9	7.9
+2.5 to +2.9	27	7.9	15.8
+2.0 to +2.4	25	7.3	23.1
+1.5 to +1.9	25	7.3	30.4
+1.0 to +1.4	56	16.4	46.8
+ .9	15	4.4	51.2
+ .8	18	5.3	56.5
+ .7	16	4.7	61.2
+ .6	14	4.1	65.3
+ .5	14	4.1	69.4
+ .4	19	5.5	74.9
+ .3	18	5.3	80.2
+ .2	15	4.4	84.6
+ .1	8	2.3	86.9
0	21	6.1	93.0
- .1 to - .5	19	5.6	98.6
- .6 or less	5	1.4	100.0
Total	342	100.0%	

Median G.E. Gain +.88

Mean Attendance
113 days or .63 school year

65% of the students gained 6 or more months in the average of a little over 6 months of instruction.

Table 7

Grade Equivalent Gains Distribution
Stanford Achievement Test, Primary II
Word Study Skills
1971-72

Grade Equivalent Gains	N	Percent	Cumulative Percent
+3.0 or more	4	2.6	2.6
+2.5 to +2.9	2	1.3	3.9
+2.0 to +2.4	8	5.3	9.2
+1.5 to +1.9	12	7.9	17.1
+1.0 to +1.4	30	19.7	36.8
+ .9	6	3.9	40.7
+ .8	8	5.3	46.0
+ .7	7	4.6	50.6
+ .6	7	4.6	55.2
+ .5	10	6.6	61.8
+ .4	12	7.9	69.7
+ .3	9	6.0	75.7
+ .2	7	4.6	80.3
+ .1	8	5.3	85.6
0	4	2.6	88.2
- .1 to - .5	12	7.9	96.1
- .6 or less	6	3.9	100.0
Total	152	100.0%	

Median G.E. Gain +.66

Mean Attendance
102 days or .56 school year

55% of the students gained 6 or more months in the average of a little less than 6 months of instruction.

Table 8

Sullivan Entrance and Exit Levels
of Students in Evaluation Group
1971-72

Sullivan Levels	Entrance Levels N	%	Cum. %	Exit Levels N	%	Cum. %
Introductory	185	36.9	36.9	5	1.0	1.0
1	84	16.8	53.7	6	1.2	2.2
2	70	14.0	67.7	25	5.0	7.2
3	59	11.8	79.5	52	10.3	17.5
4	36	7.1	86.6	51	10.2	27.7
5	18	3.6	90.2	40	8.0	35.7
6	18	3.6	93.8	53	10.6	46.3
7	20	4.0	97.8	43	8.6	54.9
8	4	.8	98.6	49	9.7	64.6
9	1	.2	98.8	48	9.6	74.2
10				21	4.2	78.4
11	1	.2	99.0	21	4.2	82.6
12	4	.8	99.8	6	1.2	83.8
13				5	1.0	84.8
14	1	.2	100.0	5	1.0	85.8
15				2	.4	86.2
16				8	1.6	87.8
17				37	7.4	95.2
18				13	2.6	97.8
19				4	.8	98.6
20				7	1.4	100.0
Totals	501	100.0%		501	100.0%	

Median Entrance Level
1.28

Median Exit Level
6.93

Range of Number of Levels Completed
0-18

Table 9

Intercorrelation Matrix
N= 494 to 501

	No. of Days Present	No. of Sullivan Levels Completed	Gates G.E. Gain
No. of Sullivan Levels Completed	+.48		
Gates G.E. Gain	+.21	+.33	
Stanford G.E. Gain	+.25	+.19	+.28

Student Questionnaire

1971-72

Six questions pertaining to the Basic Skill Centers were asked of a random sample of about two-thirds of the students in attendance at both Centers on February 9 and 10, 1972. Although the questions and possible answers were read aloud to the students so no reading problems were involved, each student had the complete questionnaire in from of him. Students were told not to put their names on the papers, but to record their responses on them. The first four questions had possible responses of: YES yes no NO. It was explained the "YES" and "NO," which were read emphatically, showed strong feelings, whereas "yes" and "no," read with less emphasis, meant a "little bit" yes or no. If the pupils knew what answers they wanted, but were unsure how to mark them, aides helped them mark but gave no other assistance. For purposes of this report the categories were collapsed, combining YES and yes as well as NO and no.

Student Questionnaire Results

When asked, "Do you like coming to the Center?," 86% of the children replied Yes although only 53% of them had said that they liked reading class in school last year.

Although these children were one or more years below grade level in the the citywide reading tests, 54% of them felt that they had been good readers last year. However, 89% of them felt that they were now better readers.

When asked which of the three parts of the Center they liked best--the classroom, multimedia room, or the Talking Typewriter--the multimedia room (47%) was the clear favorite. Twenty-eight percent of the students liked the classroom best and 24% preferred the Talking Typewriter. (Some children did not answer all the questions so the percentages do not total to 100%).

Students felt that the classroom (57%) helped them most to be better readers. The multimedia room received 22% of the votes and the Talking Typewriters received 21% of the votes. Responses are tabulated by Center in Table 3A in the Appendix.

Discussion

The Basic Skill Centers continued to be effective in achieving their goal in this fourth year of their operation. The results for 1971-72 are as gratifying as those obtained in the previous year. It is remarkable that two-thirds of the students made gains equal to or greater than would be expected

of the average child in the grade levels at which they were working. This is especially so in light of their educational handicaps described in the sections on participating schools and students. Overall, these students had been falling behind in reading a little more each year, yet according to these results their rate of gain was from once to nearly twice what might have been expected.

The Stanford Word Study Skills Test had been selected as an appropriate instrument to measure skills which were to be taught by the new programs developed by Center staff. The new materials, which stressed beginning and ending sounds as well as word families, were not introduced until near the end of the school year due to production problems. This might have accounted for the fact that the gains on the Stanford test, while still above expectation, were not so great as those on the Gates. The difference might also be due to the way in which the norms were developed for the two tests. This question can only be answered after the new programs have been fully implemented.

According to subjective measures, the Centers were viewed very favorably by parents, home school teachers, and participating students. Responses to the student questionnaire were very similar to those obtained the previous year so it can be assumed that children selected for the program do indeed like going to the Centers (over 80%) and that their other responses are typical of such students.

Recommendations

1. Continue the program at the Basic Skill Centers since the year's results showed it to be highly effective in terms of its objectives.

2. Continue the use of the different levels of the Gates-MacGinitie comprehension test and the Stanford Primary Achievement section on word study skills at the grades at which they were used in 1971-72 since this year's study showed them to be appropriate in that the means and standard deviations of the students' scores were similar to those given by the test publishers in their reliability studies.

3. Continue the development and implementation of new programs for both classroom and other media presentation since gains have been greater than in the early years of the project before such materials were added to the program.

4. Continue to provide feedback to and encourage close relationships with the participating schools. This facilitates the use of the follow-up materials for reinforcing the children's newly learned skills.

5. Continue the selection procedures that were used in 1971-72. The double screening gave the participating schools a voice in the process and let the Centers' teachers identify those who might most benefit from the program.

6. Discontinue the standardized testing of children who enter the program late or leave it early since similar results were found for both that group and those who were tested only at the beginning and end of the school year. The individually given tests are expensive in terms of both time and money and are not used for either selection or placement in the program. Discontinuing this testing will not influence the evaluation results.

Appendix

Table 1A
Parent Questionnaire 1971-72

Question:		North N=84 %	South N=43 %	Total N=127 %
1. Did the school tell you why your child was attending the BSC?	Yes	69	74	71
	No	20	12	17
	Do Not Remember	10	12	10
	No Response	1	2	2
	Total	100	100	100
	Comments: Favorable	14	14	14
	Unfavorable	5	7	6
	No Comment	81	79	80
	Total	100	100	100
2. Do you agree that your child should have been attending BSC this year?	Yes	93	93	93
	No	1	2	1
	No Response	6	5	6
	Total	100	100	100
	Comments: Favorable	12	7	10
	Unfavorable	--	2	1
	No Comment	88	91	89
	Total	100	100	100
3. Does your child read more now as a result of his attending the BSC?	Yes	65	67	66
	No	30	19	26
	No Response	5	14	8
	Total	100	100	100
	Comments: Favorable	12	7	10
	Unfavorable	12	5	9
	No Comment	76	88	80
	Total	100	100	99
4. Can your child read better now than before he attended BSC?	Yes	90	81	87
	No	4	5	4
	No Response	6	14	9
	Total	100	100	100
	Comments: Favorable	8	2	6
	Unfavorable	3	7	4
	No Comment	89	91	90
	Total	100	100	100
5. Have you visited the BSC this last school year?	Yes	19	23	20
	No	81	74	79
	No Response	--	2	1
	Total	100	99	100
	Comments: Favorable	11	7	9
	Unfavorable	2	--	1
	No Comment	87	93	90
	Total	100	100	100

Table 1A, continued

Question:		North N=84 %	South N=43 %	Total N=127 %
6. Would you be interested in having an open house again next year at the BSC?	Yes	79	70	76
	No	5	2	4
	No Response	16	28	20
	Total	100	100	100
	Comments: Favorable	7	2	5
	Unfavorable	2	--	2
	No Comment	91	98	93
	Total	100	100	100
7. Do you think the money spent on the BSC should be spent on some other educational program?	Yes	5	7	5
	No	81	77	80
	No Response	14	16	15
	Total	100	100	100
	Comments: Favorable	8	7	8
	Unfavorable	1	--	1
	No Comment	91	93	91
	Total	100	100	100
8. What do you think your child feels about his experiences at the BSC?	Enjoys	89	86	88
	Does Not Enjoy	7	5	6
	Do Not Know	4	7	5
	Blank	--	2	1
	Total	100	100	100
	Comments: Favorable	12	10	11
	Unfavorable	5	2	4
	No Comment	83	88	85
	Total	100	100	100
9. Do you think your child's attendance at the BSC has helped him in his other school work?	Yes	86	79	84
	No	4	5	4
	Do Not Know	8	12	9
	Blank	2	4	3
	Total	100	100	100
	Comments: Favorable	11	5	9
	Unfavorable	2	5	3
	No Comment	87	90	88
	Total	100	100	100
10. What other comments do you have about the BSC?	Favorable	37	31	35
	Unfavorable	2	2	2
	No Comment	61	67	63
	Total	100	100	100
11. This child is a	Boy	67	58	64
	Girl	33	42	36
	Total	100	100	100

Table 1A, continued

Question:		North N=84 %	South N=43 %	Total N=127 %
12. This child is in ___ grade	3	1	14	5
	4	67	39	57
	5	6	26	13
	6	7	7	7
	7	18	12	16
	8	1	--	1
	9	--	--	--
	Blank	--	2	1
	Total	100	100	100

North School:	N=84 N	%	South School:	N=43 N	%
Hall	8	9	Seward	15	35
Franklin	4	5	Whittier	3	7
Jordan	11	13	Corcoran	3	7
Sheridan	8	9	Irving	--	--
Harrison	4	5	Bancroft	4	9
Lowell	5	6	Adams	2	5
Bremer	17	20	Lyndale	2	5
Prescott	5	6	Phillips	5	12
Hawthorne	14	17	Madison	8	18
Willard	8	9	Blank	1	2
Blank	--	--			
Total	84	99	Total	43	100

Table 2A

Teacher Questionnaire 1971-72

Question:		North N=32 %	South N=46 %	Total N=78 %
1. Grade	3	--	13	8
	4	47	30	37
	5	25	30	28
	6	22	22	22
	Mixed	6	4	5
	Total	100	99	100
2. Number of children from your classroom who attend the Center	1	16	9	11
	2	19	15	17
	3	3	18	11
	4	9	24	18
	5	13	13	13
	6	13	4	8
	7	6	2	4
	8	6	7	6
	9	6	--	3
	10	6	4	5
	12	--	2	1
	15	3	--	1
	No Response	--	2	1
	Total	100	100	99
3. What do the pupils in your room work on while these students are at the Center?				
1) Reading, Language Arts		67	67	67
2) Social Studies		3	9	6
3) Math		6	11	9
4) Social Studies		3	--	1
5) Handwriting, Dictionary Skills		3	--	1
6) Mixed		9	13	11
7) Blank		9	--	4
	Total	100	100	99
4. Did you participate in the selection of children attending the Center?	Yes	66	81	74
	No	25	17	20
	Both	3	2	3
	No Response	6	--	3
	Total	100	100	100
5. Do the children who attend the Center participate regularly in Language Arts periods at your school?	Yes	81	94	89
	No	19	6	11
	Total	100	100	100
6. Were all children attending the BSC grouped together with one or two teachers for Language Arts at your school?	Yes	41	37	39
	No	56	63	60
	No Response	3	--	1
	Total	100	100	100

Table 2A, continued

Question:		North N=32 %	South N=46 %	Total N=78 %
7. Were the BSC's follow-up materials and suggestions used during Language Arts periods for the children who went to the Center?	Yes	63	63	63
	No	28	33	31
	Both	3	2	2
	No Response	6	2	4
	Total	100	100	100
8. Were they used for other children at your school?	Yes	12	17	16
	No	72	76	74
	No Response	16	7	10
	Total	100	100	100
9. Do you think that those who attended the Center were the ones most in need of special help in reading?	Yes	84	89	87
	No	16	11	13
	Total	100	100	100
10. Do you think the pupils who went to the BSC are reading Better than they were last Fall?	Yes	88	92	90
	No	3	4	4
	Both	3	2	2
	No Response	6	2	4
	Total	100	100	100
11. Do you think they are reading More than they were last Fall?	Yes	53	70	63
	No	28	26	27
	Both	--	2	1
	No Response	19	2	9
	Total	100	100	100
12. If "yes" to either of the last two questions, do you think this can be attributed to the BSC program?	Yes	75	83	79
	No	--	4	3
	Both	--	4	3
	No Response	25	9	15
	Total	100	100	100
14. Comparing behavior of these children in your room now with what it was last Fall, would you say it is	Better	22	22	22
	Worse	--	--	--
	About the Same	75	76	76
	No Response	3	2	2
	Total	100	100	100
15. Do the children seem to enjoy going to the Center?	Yes	69	80	76
	No	9	13	11
	Both	13	7	9
	No Response	9	--	4
	Total	100	100	100
16. Given children of the same achievement level as these were last Fall, would you want them to attend BSC next year?	Yes	85	87	86
	No	9	9	9
	Both	3	--	1
	No Response	3	4	4
	Total	100	100	100

Table 2A, continued

Question:		North N=32 %	South N=46 %	Total N=78 %
17. If you have previously had students who attended the Center, how do you think this year's program compares with that of other years?	Same	3	31	19
	Worse	--	--	--
	Better	50	26	36
	No Previous Experience	34	41	39
	No Response	13	2	6
	Total	100	100	100
18. Do you have any further comments you would like to make on the BSC's program?	Favorable	63	24	40
	Unfavorable	6	17	13
	Suggestions	6	7	6
	No Comment	25	52	41
	Total	100	100	100

Table 3A

Basic Skill Centers
Student Questionnaire, February 9 and 10, 1972[a]

Question	Response	North Center N	North Center %	South Cent- N	South Cent- %	Total Group N	Total Group %
1. Do you like coming to the Center?	Yes	116	89	108	83	224	86
	No	15	11	22	17	37	14
2. Did you like reading class at school last year?	Yes	72	55	66	51	138	53
	No	55	42	57	44	112	43
	Blank	4	3	7	5	11	4
3. Were you a good reader last year?	Yes	69	53	73	56	142	54
	No	62	47	55	42	117	45
	Blank			2	2	2	1
4. Are you a better reader now?	Yes	118	90	113	87	231	89
	No	13	10	16	12	29	11
	Blank			1	1	1	--
5. Which part of the Center do you like best?[b]	Cl. Rm.	42	32	31	24	73	28
	M.M.	55	42	69	53	124	47
	T.T.	34	26	28	22	62	24
	Blank			2	1	2	1
6. Which part of the Center helps you most to be a better reader?	Cl. Rm.	76	58	72	55	148	57
	M.M.	28	21	29	22	57	22
	T.T.	27	21	27	21	54	21
	Blank			2	2	2	--

[a]Answered by a random sample of 261 comprising two-thirds of those in attendance. The questions were read aloud to the students. Four response categories were collapsed for this table.

[b]Cl. Rm. means Class Room; MM means Multi-Media; TT means Talking Typewriters.

Minneapolis Public Schools

Educational Services Division
Planning, Development and Federal Programs

Harry N. Vakos, PhD., Assistant Superintendent
Educational Services

Planning and Development

Lawrence P. Moon, PhD., Director of Planning, Development and Federal Programs

Mary C. Kasbohm, Assistant Director of Planning, Development and Federal Programs

Wallace J. Spolar, Fiscal Manager

Emma N. Hudson, Coordinator, Title I ESEA

Ruby M. Riney, Coordinator, Title I ESEA

Marge Hols, Dissemination Specialist

Rebecca S. Howard, Dissemination Specialist

Research and Evaluation

Richard W. Faunce, PhD., Director for Research

Lary R. Johnson, Research Associate

Robert L. Bergeth, PhD., Title I Evaluator

Sara H. Clark, Title I Evaluator