

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 111 833

TM 004 800

TITLE: Report: Priorities of Problems, Program Areas, Solutions to Problems and Capital Construction Needs.

INSTITUTION: Dade County Public Schools, Miami, Fla. Dept. of Planning and Evaluation.

PUB DATE: 12 Jun 75

NOTE: 66p.

EDRS PRICE: MF-\$0.76 HC-\$3.32 Plus Postage

DESCRIPTORS: Academic Achievement; Administrator Attitudes; Basic Skills; Class Size; *Community Attitudes; Discipline; Educational Objectives; *Educational Problems; Educational Programs; Elementary Secondary Education; Individual Needs; Interviews; Problem Solving; School Construction; *School Systems; *Surveys; Teacher Attitudes; Teaching Skills

IDENTIFIERS: *Dade County Public Schools

ABSTRACT

A sample of the general population of Dade County residents were surveyed, by interviews, by an independent research firm during December, 1973 regarding educational goals, major problems confronting the schools and their opinions regarding certain school system programs. It was decided to refine and augment those results by surveying specific involved and informed groups regarding four topics: (1) priorities of problems facing the school system, (2) priorities of broad program areas, (3) emphasis on solutions to problems, and (4) priorities of capital construction needs. This survey, conducted during March, 1975, involved 9,695 individual respondents; approximately one-third of which indicated that they were parents of students presently enrolled in Dade County Public Schools. The respondent groups were: community advisory committees and other community or school-related groups, county/area administrators, elementary and secondary school principals and assistants, and elementary and secondary teachers. The degree of agreement between respondent groups was consistently high. The survey instrument, asking respondents to rank fifteen possible problems facing the school system, is included as well as the detailed survey results. (Author/RC)

 * Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
 * materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
 * to obtain the best copy available. nevertheless, items of marginal *
 * reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
 * of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
 * via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
 * responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
 * supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *

ED 118 535

Dade County Public Schools
Miami, Florida

Report:

Priorities of Problems, Program Areas,
Solutions to Problems and Capital
Construction Needs

TM004 800

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
1975 O 280-000

Planning & Evaluation Department

DADE COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD

Dr. Ben Sheppard, Chairman
Mrs. Ethel Beckham, Vice Chairman
Mr. G. Holmes Braddock
Mrs. Phyllis Miller
Mr. Robert Renick
Mr. William Turner
Dr. Linton Tyler

Dr. E. L. Whigham, Superintendent of Schools

**REPORT:
PRIORITIES OF PROBLEMS, PROGRAM AREAS,
SOLUTIONS TO PROBLEMS AND CAPITAL
CONSTRUCTION NEEDS**

Prepared by
Department of Planning and Evaluation
Dade County Public Schools
1410 Northeast Second Avenue
Miami, Florida 33132
June 12, 1975

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
OVERVIEW OF FINDINGS	2
Priorities of Problems	3
Priorities of Existing Programs	5
Emphasis on Solutions to Problems	7
Priorities of Capital Construction Needs	9
INFORMATION RELATED TO THE FIVE MOST SERIOUS PROBLEMS IDENTIFIED IN THE SURVEY	9
General Discipline and Severe or Repeated Misbehavior	9
Class Size	11
Overcrowding in Schools	16
Achievement in Basic Skills	19
DESIGN OF THE SURVEY	22
Purposes of the Study	22
Identification of Respondent Groups	22
Construction of the Survey Instrument	23
Administration of the Survey Instrument	24
Procedures for Analyses of the Data	24
Limitations of the Study	25
COMPARISON OF MEAN RANKINGS, BY GROUPS, FOR EMPHASIS ON SOLUTIONS TO PROBLEMS	26
ANALYSES OF ITEMS FOR EACH RESPONDENT GROUP AND COMPOSITE OF ALL GROUPS	30
Priorities of Problems	31
Priorities of Program Areas	38
Priorities of Capital Construction Needs	46
THE SURVEY INSTRUMENT	54

INTRODUCTION

A sample of the general population of Dade County residents were surveyed, by interviews, by an independent research firm during December, 1973 regarding educational goals, major problems confronting the schools and their opinions regarding certain school system programs*. It was decided to refine and augment those results by surveying specific involved and informed groups regarding four topics: 1) Priorities of Problems Facing the School System, 2) Priorities of Broad Programs Areas, 3) Emphasis on Solutions to Problems, and 4) Priorities of Capital Construction Needs.

This survey, which was conducted during March, 1975, involved 9,695 individual respondents; approximately one-third of which indicated that they were parents of students presently enrolled in Dade County Public Schools.

The respondent groups were:

Category	Number Responding
Community Advisory Committees	478
Other Participating Community or School-Related Groups	267
County/Area Administrators	208
Secondary School Principals/Assistants	228
Elementary School Principals/Assistants	288
Secondary Teachers	4,094
Elementary Teachers	4,132
Total Responses Processed**	9,695

**

For further respondent group identification, see page 22.

* Hubbell, Ned and Associates, How Dade County Residents View their Schools, December, 1973.

OVERVIEW OF FINDINGS

The degree of agreement between respondent groups, in each of the four categories (Problems, Program Areas, Solutions to Problems and Construction Needs) was consistently high.

PRIORITIES OF PROBLEMS

Respondents were asked to rank fifteen possible problems facing the school system and were asked to add other serious problems not included in the list of problems provided. (See page 54 for the complete survey instrument).

The table below presents the fifteen problems ranked according to the responses of the composite of all groups so that comparison may be made of the mean rankings of each of the groups involved. Specific data regarding rankings by specific groups may be found on pages 30-37.

Comparison of Mean Ranking, by Groups

Item	Item No.	Composite All Groups	Advisory Committees	Other Community Groups	County/Area Administrators	Sec. Principals/ Assistants	Elem. Principals/ Assistants	Secondary Teachers	Elementary Teachers
General Discipline	1	1	2	1	1	2	3	1	1
Severe/Repeated Misbehavior	2	2	6	5	5	1	1	2	3
Class Size	4	3	4	4	8	6	5	5	2
Overcrowded Schools	3	4	3	2	4	4	6	3	4
Achievement/Basic Skills	11	5	1	3	3	3	2	4	6
Special Needs of Students	9	6	5	6	2	5	4	6	5
Finances-Operating	7	7	8	8	6	7	7	7	7
Curriculum Adaptability	10	8	9	9	7	8	8	8	8
Public Attitude	14	9	13	13	11	10	10	9	9
Curriculum Balance	15	10	11	10	12	12	9	12	10
Finances-Capital	6	11	10	11	10	9	12	10	12
Competency of Teachers	12	12	7	7	9	11	11	13	11
Substance Abuse	5	13	12	12	14	13	15	11	13
Integration	8	14	15	15	15	14	13	14	14
Racial/Ethnic Discrimination	13	15	14	14	13	15	14	15	15

* Respondents ranked 15 problems facing the school system; the most serious was given the rank of 1.

Observations from Data in Chart

- General Discipline is clearly the top-ranking problem with substantial agreement between all respondent groups.
- Advisory committees, other community groups and county/area administrators perceived Severe/Repeated Misbehavior as less serious than did teachers and school-based administrators.
- Class size was considered as a very serious problem by elementary teachers but less serious by county/area administrators.
- Achievement in Basic Skills received a composite ranking of fifth, but advisory committees ranked it as first and elementary teachers ranked it as sixth.
- The problem of responding to Special Needs of Individual Students was ranked sixth by the composite group, but was ranked as second by county/area administrators.
- Competency Level of Teachers was given a composite ranking of twelfth, but advisory committees and other community groups ranked the problem as seventh.

Other Problems Listed by Respondents

When asked to list additional problem not included in the survey instrument, several were frequently mentioned. In order of frequency of mentions, these were:

Administrative Competence
Teacher Tenure
Attendance of Students
Traffic at Elementary Schools

Information Related to the Five Most Serious Problems

Summaries of information related to the five most serious problems identified in the survey may be found on pages 9-18.

PRIORITIES OF EXISTING PROGRAM AREAS

Respondents were asked to rank seventeen existing program areas according to their feelings as to their relative importance in terms of meeting the needs of the students. Top priority items in this series related to the more traditional general purposes of public education. The following summary table of mean rankings by individual groups and by the composite of all groups depicts a substantial degree of agreement between the groups. More detailed data regarding the rankings of program areas by the individual groups may be found on pages 38-45.

Priorities of Existing Program Areas
Comparison of Mean Ranking, by Groups

Item	Item No.	Composite All Groups	Advisory Committees	Other Community Groups	County/Area Administrators	Sec. Principals/ Assistants	Elem. Principals/ Assistants	Secondary Teachers	Elementary Teachers
General Knowledge	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	
Basic Skills	5	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	
Attitudes-Values	7	3	3	4	3	3	4	3	
Effective Citizenship	10	4	4	5	4	5	4	5	
Prevention/Treatment Misbehavior	17	5	7	6	6	6	5	6	
Saleable Vocational Skills	3	6	5	3	5	4	6	3	
College Preparation	2	7	6	8	9	8	12	7	
Career Education (Elem., Jr. High)	16	8	9	7	8	7	9	8	
Exceptional Child Education	11	9	8	9	7	12	7	12	
Physical/Health Education	4	10	12	11	11	10	10	10	
Compensatory Education (Local)	12	11	10	10	10	11	8	11	
Family Living/ Consumer Education	15	12	13	12	12	9	11	9	
Environmental Educ.	8	13	11	13	14	13	14	13	
Aesthetics/Fine Arts	6	14	14	16	13	15	13	14	
Adult Education	13	15	15	14	15	14	17	15	
Community Schools	14	16	17	15	17	16	15	16	
Bilingual Education	9	17	16	17	16	17	16	17	

* Respondents ranked 17 program areas; the most important was ranked as 1.

EMPHASIS ON SOLUTIONS TO PROBLEMS

Respondents were given a listing of thirty-four activities or programs which are considered by some to be viable means of improving the quality of education in the Dade County Schools. They were asked circle one of the following responses for each item. 1) Critical, 2) Very Important, 3) Important, 4) Less Important, 5) Not Important. A mean response was computed for each item for each respondent group and for the composite of all groups. The items were then ranked according to the mean responses for the composite group. The top six items and bottom six items are presented below in a chart that depicts comparative rankings across groups. A complete comparison chart, with all thirty-four items included, may be found on pages 26-29.

Six Highest Ranked Solutions to Problems
Comparison of Mean Ranking, by Groups

Item	Item No.	Composite All Groups	Advisory Committees	Other Community Groups	County/Area Administrators	Sec. Principals/ Assistants	Elem. Principals/ Assistants	Secondary Teachers	Elementary Teachers
Increased emphasis on prevention/control of student misbehavior.	3	1	10	4	3	2	5	2	1
Improve basic skills competencies by expanding reading and math programs at all levels.	10	2	1	1	1	1	2	1	4
Allocate additional personnel to schools to assure appropriate pupil-teacher ratios.	5	3	4	6	11	8	1	5	2
Increase emphasis on attracting, hiring, retaining "good" teachers.	6	4	2	2	2	5	4	3	6
Maintain a balance in the curriculum by increasing emphasis on basic education such as math, science, social studies, language arts.	27	5	3	3	8	6	3	4	8
Relieve overcrowding in schools by constructing additional schools.	18	6	5	8	6	3	9	6	5

Six Lowest Ranked Solutions to Problems
Comparison of Mean Ranking, by Groups

Item	Item No.	Composite All Groups	Advisory Committees	Other Community Groups	County/Area Administrators	Sec. Principals/ Assistants	Elem. Principals/ Assistants	Secondary Teachers	Elementary Teachers
Increase emphasis on consumer education.	32	29	29	31	28	25	28	22	30
Continue to expand the Community School program.	22	30	27	29	32	31	27	31	29
Increase participation of the community through an improved or expanded community advisory committee structure.	21	31	17	26	30	30	32	30	31
Develop a program of educational options.	30	32	33	33	29	26	31	32	32
Insure that all non-Spanish speaking pupils are given the voluntary opportunity to learn to speak and write Spanish.	16	33	32	32	33	33	29	33	33
Expand implementation of the elementary. Quarter curriculum.	8	34	34	34	34	34	34	34	34

Observations from Data on Solutions to Problems (Top Six and bottom Six.)

- Increased Emphasis on Prevention/Control of Student Misbehavior received the number one derived ranking in the list of thirty-four solutions to problems by the composite of all groups and by elementary teachers, but advisory committee members perceived the item as less important by placing it as tenth.
- County/area administrators disagreed somewhat with other groups by placing less emphasis on the need for allocating additional personnel to schools to assure appropriate pupil-teacher ratios.
- There was a remarkable degree of agreement among the groups in the bottom six items except; item 21-advisory committees placed a higher value than other groups or the expansion of advisory committees and, item 32-secondary teachers placed a slightly higher value on increasing the emphasis on consumer education.

Other Observations from Data on Solutions to Problems

(See pages 26-29 for complete comparison charts.)

Several frequently recommended solutions to problems failed to be ranked in the top half of the list of thirty-four solutions listed. Some were:

- Increased Discretionary Use of Resources at the School Level (eighteenth)
- Improved Staff Development programs (nineteenth)
- Responding to Societal Problems (drug abuse, alcoholism, etc.) by Expanding the Comprehensive Health Education programs (twenty-second)
- Expand the Elementary Counselor program (twenty-third)
- Expand Career Awareness/Career Exploratory programs at elementary/junior high levels (twenty-fifth)
- Expand Placement/Follow-up services (twenty-seventh).

Additional Solutions Proposed by Respondents

At the end of the list of thirty-four possible solutions to problems, respondents were asked to add any other solutions deemed important. Some additional solutions proposed by various respondents were:

- Provide for more teacher input into the decisionmaking process.
- Lower the maximum age for compulsory attendance.
- Increase academic penalties for excessive absences.
- Improve administrative competence by providing more workshops in budgetary procedures, school law and union matters.

PRIORITIES OF CAPITAL CONSTRUCTION NEEDS

Respondents were asked to consider the fact that projected funds for capital construction will not be adequate over the next five years to meet the system's identified needs, and to assign a rank, one to six, to six capital construction needs that may compete for limited funds. The following chart gives a comparison of the rankings by each group and the composite of all groups. Additional data regarding individual group responses may be found on pages 46-53.

**Priorities of Capital Construction Needs
Comparison of Mean Ranking, by Groups**

Item	Item No.	Composite All Groups	Advisory Committees	Other Community Groups	County/Area Administrators	Sec. Principals/ Assistants	Elem. Principals/ Assistants	Secondary Teachers	Elementary Teachers
Aircondition Schools	1	1	2	1	3	2	2	1	1
Eliminate Double Session	4	2	1	3	1	1	1	2	4
Replace Obsolete Schools	5	3	3	2	2	3	3	3	3
Renovate/Adapt Existing Facilities	6	4	4	4	4	4	4	5	2
Additional Vocational Facilities	2	5	6	5	5	5	6	4	6
Maintain/Improve Existing Facilities	3	6	5	6	6	6	5	6	5

Should Strict Adherence to Established Priorities be Observed?

In reference to the six Capital Construction Needs, the respondents were asked to answer the following question: "If priorities were established for the above in some satisfactory manner, do you agree that the needs should be met in strict priority order (i.e., priority need number one should be completely met before priority need number two receives funds, etc.)?"

 Yes No

The composite of all groups slightly favored the affirmative response, with 50.3% responding, "Yes". However, 54.8% of Area/County Administrators and 50.9% of Secondary Principals/Assistant/Principals said, "No". See pages 46-53 for additional details regarding this question and the responses by the various groups.

INFORMATION RELATED TO THE FIVE MOST SERIOUS PROBLEMS IDENTIFIED IN THE SURVEY

Summaries of information related to the five most serious problems identified within the survey are provided within this section for planners and decisionmakers. As one can readily observe, the problems which have been identified are of such a nature that any summary-like countywide information may only serve as a starting point for an adequate analysis of the problem. In some cases, additional studies or reports pertaining to these areas have already been prepared; these reports and their availability have been indicated.

GENERAL DISCIPLINE AND SEVERE OR-REPEATED MISBEHAVIOR

These two problem areas were identified as being the most critical of the problems of the school system.

These areas are particularly difficult to analyze on a cross-school basis. Some student behavior which would be viewed as undesirable in one school may be tolerated and even condoned in other school settings. Two of the best sources of information about disruptive activity on the part of pupils can be found in suspensions and expulsions information and in an analysis of incidents which were reported to the Security Department.

In terms of suspensions and expulsions, the numbers have dropped rather dramatically during the past few years. This drop can be reasonably attributed to the opening and operation of In-School Centers for Special Instruction and to the availability of alternative schools. As one can note from the following chart, the suspension/expulsion rate has dropped by 38% between 1972-73 and 1973-74. Data which is already available for the 1974-75 school year indicates a continuation of this trend.

COMPARISON OF SUSPENSIONS AND EXPULSIONS

Year	Principals' Suspensions	Additional 30-Day Suspensions	Expulsions	Total First Month Membership
1969-70	9,730	236	43	244,157 ^a
1970-71	9,759	299	68	240,472 ^b
1971-72	11,957	518	157	245,242
1972-73	8,066 ^c	517	135	241,995
1973-74	4,733 ^c	154	23	244,565
1974-75*	2,939	1	0	246,739

^a Includes 1,671 Headstart pupils.

^b Includes 1,431 Headstart pupils.

^c Reduction attributed to School Centers for Special Instruction

* Through April 17, 1975.

An analysis of total incidents reported to the Security Department would reveal the extent of seriously disruptive incidents. It should be noted that some of the apparent increase in security incidents during this year is likely due to improved and more rigorous reporting procedures and does not, then, necessarily indicate a substantial upswing in disruptive behavior. While the statistics in the following chart are clearly disturbing, it should be realized that many of these incidents involved persons other than those enrolled in the schools. Of those incidents involving only students enrolled in Dade County Public Schools, less than 2% of the student body were involved.

COMPARISON OF REPORTED SECURITY INCIDENTS

Offense Class	71-72	72-73	73-74	74-75*
Homicide	NA	1	1	-
Forcible Rape	NA	4	6	19
Robbery	NA	150	119	163
Assaults, Aggravated (non-classified)	NA	-	143	251
Personnel/Student	NA	175	131	134
Student/Student	NA	674	566	633
Personnel/Non-Student	NA	17	19	43
Student/Non-Student	NA	40	40	86
Breaking and Entering	NA	1,078	1,282	1,493
Larceny-Theft (except Auto Theft)	NA	895	1,298	1,988
Arson	101	29	42	61
Malicious Mischief (Vandalism)	NA	246	308	1,060
Narcotic Drug Law	NA	244	163	139

* Year to date, July 1 to April 30, 1975.

At the present time the school system is offering a series of programs addressed to these problems. These include:

	Number of Cases Served
In-School Centers for Special Instruction	128,002 student days*
Socially Maladjusted Classes	1,311
Emotionally Disturbed Classes	691

* Total number of student days between July 1, 1974 and April 3, 1975; all other data represents number of individual students served during 1974-75.

CLASS SIZE *

Class size has again been identified as a major problem in the school system.

It is also a concern in most other school districts in the United States, except for a few highly affluent suburban districts. Research in this area has not, of course, found any consistent relationship between class size and pupil achievement; however, most teachers and parents would agree that a smaller class size contributes to an environment more conducive to individualizing instruction and to a more productive classroom climate. The major constraint to reducing class size in any school district involve the tremendous increase in costs which must be incurred for even minor reductions, both in terms of operating costs and expanded facilities.

What is the typical teacher-pupil ratio in the Dade County Schools?

For elementary schools, if one excludes classes for exceptional children (Retarded, Handicapped, Disturbed, Gifted), and includes federal programs, the teacher-pupil ratio as of October, 1974, was as follows:

Elementary Personnel used for Computation of Average Load	Pupils	Classes	Staff	Average Load
Regular Professional Teachers	1,114,995	3,657	3,657	30.5
Regular Professional Teachers plus Aides and Assistants**	-	-	4,212	26.5
Regular Professional Teachers plus Aides/Assistants** and Music, Art, Physical Educa- tion, Bilingual Teachers	-	-	5,066.3	22.0

As one may observe from the above chart, the average teacher-load decreases dramatically for elementary schools upon inclusion of teacher aides and assistants in the total. Teacher aides and assistants provide valuable services to professional teachers in reducing their overall work-loads. During 1974-75, approximately 1,110 such personnel were utilized in elementary schools. If one includes the services of art, music, physical education, and bilingual teachers in the load factor, class size is further reduced. Instructional personnel for these special programs in elementary schools have been increased substantially during the past few years.

* Additional information pertaining to this area may be found in the following documents issued on an annual basis by the Administrative Research Office: Elementary Class Size: October, 1974 and Secondary Class Size: October, 1974.

** Two aides or assistants equals one teacher.

Trend-wide, over the past few years, the elementary professional classroom teacher-pupil ratio in the school system has remained nearly constant (if one excludes the services of such specialists as art, music, physical education, and bilingual teachers, and if one discounts the growing use of teacher aides and assistants). The following chart depicts this trend:

ELEMENTARY PROFESSIONAL TEACHER-PUPIL RATIOS*

	1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974
Teacher-Pupil Ratio	30.2	29.5	31.1	31.3	30.8	30.5
Percent of Classes with 25 or Fewer Pupils	9.4%	13.0%	5.6%	4.2%	5.0%	7.7%
Percent of Classes with a Range of 26-35 Pupils	87.3	82.6	87.1	88.8	88.0	85.2
Percent of Classes with 36 or More Pupils**	3.3	4.4	7.3	7.0	7.0	7.1

* Classes by homeroom, excluding exceptional child education.

** Larger classes feature the use of aides in conjunction with the professional classroom teacher. The above display involves regular classroom teachers and excludes the services of aides/assistants and resource teachers.

Upon viewing elementary class size trends by grade levels, it should be noted that the average class size of 1-3 classes has decreased slightly over the three year period, while those for kindergarten and 4-6 have remained stable.

ELEMENTARY CLASS SIZE, OCTOBER EACH YEAR
1972-73, 1973-74, 1974-75*

Year	Kindergarten		Grade 1-3		Grade 4-6	
	No. Classes	Avg.	No. Classes	Avg.	No. Classes	Avg.
1972-73	449	24.6	1,736	30.3	1,767	32.0
1973-74	445	25.9	1,748	29.0	1,803	32.4
1974-75	501	24.9	1,722	28.9	1,868	32.0

* Excludes combination classes

Secondary school class sizes for 1974-75 are as follows (excluding classes for exceptional pupils):

Type Classes	Junior High Schools			Senior High Schools		
	Classes	Pupils	Load	Classes	Pupils	Load
All Classes	11,530	325,787	28.3	11,903	314,376	26.4
Vocational/ Technical Classes	878	16,109	18.3	1,676	31,920	19.0
Art, Music, Health/Physical Education Classes	2,001	75,505	37.7	1,523	51,894	34.1
All Classes ex- cluding Vocational, Art, Music, and Health/Physical Education	8,651	234,173	27.1	8,704	230,562	26.5

(Professional classroom teacher-pupil ratio as of October, 1974; includes federal programs.)

Trend-wise, class size for junior high schools has decreased slightly during the past few years with senior high class size remaining nearly constant.

AVERAGE PROFESSIONAL TEACHER-PUPIL RATIOS FOR SELECTED
SECONDARY SCHOOL CLASSES: 1969-1974 *

	1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974
Junior High Teacher-Pupil Ratio	27.5	26.2	26.7	27.6	27.3	26.8
Senior High Teacher-Pupil Ratio	25.4	24.8	25.3	26.0	25.8	25.7
Percent of All Secondary Classes with 25 or Fewer Pupils	36.4%	43.7%	40.7%	35.9%	37.9%	39.8%
Percent of All Secondary Classes with a Range of 26-35 Pupils	60.7	53.5	56.0	59.1	57.4	55.4
Percent of Classes with 36 or More Pupils	2.9	2.8	3.3	5.0	4.7	4.8

* Classes by subject, excluding exceptional child education, ITV, health education, physical education, music, cooperative business education, and non-credit classes such as study hall.

Finally, one may attempt to compare average class size within Dade County to that of other districts, the state of Florida itself, and the nation. This comparison must be approached very cautiously since class size is dependent not only on the wealth of a district/state and the degree to which citizens are willing to tax themselves to support education but also on needs for programming. Exceptional child and vocational classes typically feature lower teacher-pupil ratios and the need for such programming is not the same in different districts. Given these qualifications, the professional teacher-pupil ratio in Dade County (excluding teacher aides and assistants) was slightly above the national average, the average for Florida, and for that of the Southeast for 1973-74:

COMPARISON OF PROFESSIONAL CLASSROOM TEACHER-PUPIL RATIOS: 1973-74
(K-12 SCHOOLS)

	Enrollment, October, 1973	Total Teachers	Teacher/Pupil Ratio
Dade County*	244,565	10,318	23.7
Florida	1,537,952	67,532	22.8
Alabama	770,739	34,234	22.5
Georgia	1,085,881	45,375	23.9
Louisiana	842,152	41,884	20.1
Mississippi	519,786	23,472	22.1
North Carolina	1,173,415	51,277	22.9
South Carolina	626,914	26,960	23.3
Tennessee	902,704	37,150	24.3
Virginia	1,085,295	51,761	21.0
SOUTHEAST	8,544,838	379,645	22.5
UNITED STATES	45,408,805	2,125,094	21.4

* Equivalent information for October, 1974:

Enrollment	Teachers	T/P Ratio
246,739	11,129	22.2

(Source: Statistics of Public Elementary and Secondary Day Schools, Fall 1973, U.S. Office of Education.)

The major constraint, of course, to reducing class size within the Dade County School System is money. Even a reduction of one pupil per teacher in the present system staffing ratios for all schools would result in increased appropriations of well over \$5 million. The major factor, however, which prohibits a reduction in class size at the present time involves the availability of classrooms to accommodate reduced classes. At the present time, of the system's 231 regular school plants, only 46 or 20% are being under utilized. Of these, 43 are elementary schools which are located in areas of the county in which population has begun to decline or shift to other locations. Most secondary schools in the county

are, of course, on a ten-hour day. A reduction in class size is not, in fact, possible to any degree where school facilities are not available.

Until school construction within the system can adequately catch up to classroom needs, discussions about reduced class size, even if operating funds were available, are in the main academic.

OVERCROWDING IN SCHOOLS *

Overcrowding in schools was also mentioned as a major problem area by most groups.

Unquestionably, this represents a significant problem for the school system as a whole. It is not a problem, however, for many schools within the system. As one can observe from a review of the following chart, the problem is mainly confined to secondary schools and to elementary schools in high growth areas. In fact, most elementary schools, 130 out of 172, are either being normally utilized or have student membership below their capacity.

ANALYSIS OF SCHOOL OVERCROWDING - 1974-75

	Current Program Capacity	First Month Membership	Student Stations Excess (Deficit)	Number of Schools:		
				Utilized More Than 100%**	Utilized Less Than 90%***	Normally Utilized 90% - 110%
Elem:						
NE Area	14,250	12,874	1,376	-	9	13
NW Area	22,530	22,065	465	5	7	17
NC Area	23,020	22,028	992	7	12	13
SC Area	23,385	23,275	110	11	11	12
SW Area	21,835	23,100	(1,265)	8	1	19
S Area	20,430	22,452	(2,022)	11	3	13
	<u>125,450</u>	<u>125,794</u>	<u>(344)</u>	<u>42</u>	<u>43</u>	<u>87</u>
Jr. High:						
NE Area	6,888	7,308	(420)	2	-	4
NW Area	7,700	10,401	(2,701)	3	-	3
NC Area	7,332	7,749	(417)	2	-	4
SC Area	11,350	12,638	(1,288)	5	2	3
SW Area	7,135	12,227	(5,092)	6	-	-
S Area	5,562	9,620	(4,058)	5	-	-
	<u>45,967</u>	<u>59,943</u>	<u>(13,976)</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>14</u>
Sr. High:						
NE Area	9,095	10,192	(1,097)	2	1	1
NW Area	7,634	10,773	(3,139)	2	-	1
NC Area	8,734	9,712	(978)	1	-	3
SC Area	7,825	9,611	(1,786)	1	-	2
SW Area	10,048	11,974	(1,926)	2	-	2
S Area	4,123	7,119	(2,996)	2	-	-
	<u>47,459</u>	<u>59,381</u>	<u>(11,922)</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>9</u>
	<u>218,876</u>	<u>245,118</u>	<u>(26,242)</u>	<u>75</u>	<u>46</u>	<u>110</u>

* Additional information pertaining to this topic is provided in the following document issued by the Physical Plant Planning Department: Five-Year Construction Plan for Partially Meeting Capital Requirements: 1974-79.

** Utilization is calculated as First Month Membership ÷ Current Program Capacity.

+ Classrooms not used for instructional purposes are frequently assigned to house special program administrators.

The school system presently constructs or renovates its school plants within the umbrella of a five-year construction plan. This plan includes not only the construction of regular school facilities but special purpose facilities such as exceptional child centers and area vocational centers. In the following chart, the net effect by area of capital projects which are presently budgeted is displayed. Of those projects which are presently budgeted, it is estimated that all will be completed by September of the 1977-78 school year. These projects will add 27,563 additional student stations to the 218,876 which are presently available. The five-year construction plan would add even more student stations; its implementation is subject to the availability of state funds.

ANALYSIS OF PROJECTED STUDENT STATIONS FOR BUDGETED CAPITAL PROJECTS *

	AREA					Unassigned Relocatables	Total
	NE	NW	NC	SC	SW		
Number of new student stations budgeted for completion by September, 1977:							
Elementary	-	930	-	930	930	-	4,920
Junior High	-	2,800	-	1,580	4,200	-	12,780
Senior High	-	2,600	1,933	-	-	-	7,133
Unassigned Relocatables	-	6,330	1,933	2,510	5,130	2,730	2,730
							<u>27,563</u>
Total number of student stations projected in use in September, 1977:							
Elementary	14,250	23,460	23,020	24,315	22,765	-	130,370
Junior High	6,888	10,500	7,332	12,930	11,335	-	58,474
Senior High	9,095	10,234	10,667	7,825	10,048	-	54,592
Unassigned Relocatables	30,233	44,194	41,019	45,070	44,148	2,730	2,730
							<u>246,439</u>
Projected K-12 membership in September, 1977:							
Elementary	12,355	23,980	21,110	21,065	23,995	-	126,305
Junior High	7,865	13,540	9,040	12,090	12,930	-	65,955
Senior High	8,930	8,980	8,470	10,145	12,530	-	56,779
	<u>29,150</u>	<u>46,500</u>	<u>38,620</u>	<u>43,300</u>	<u>49,455</u>		<u>249,039</u>
Projected excess (deficiency) of student stations in September, 1977:							
Elementary	1,895	(520)	1,910	3,250	(1,230)	-	4,065
Junior High	(977)	(3,040)	(1,708)	840	(1,595)	-	(7,208)
Senior High	165	1,254	2,197	(2,320)	(2,482)	-	(2,187)
Unassigned Relocatables	1,083	(2,306)	2,399	1,770	(5,307)	2,730	2,730
							<u>(2,600)</u>

* Does not include additional student stations which will be provided by area vocational-technical centers; the number of student stations which will be included within these facilities is not available at this time.

ACHIEVEMENT - BASIC SKILLS *

Achievement in the basic skills continues to be perceived as a major problem area for the school system. This perception, of course, is not unique to the Dade County Schools. Even a cursory examination of the planning and budgeting documents of most major school districts and of the stated objectives of state departments of education and of the United States Office of Education would demonstrate a concern for performance in this area. This school system, in fact, has publicly and repeatedly addressed itself to this problem; the foremost objective and resulting programs of the Major System Objectives are concerned with improving both individual and group performance in the basic skills.

If one attempts to obtain a comprehensive and accurate picture of the extent of this problem, the information which is presently available is not adequate. In fact, at this point in time, there is not available within the United States a test which embodies a practical working definition and assessment of functional literacy. The Florida Statewide Assessment program is attempting to define and assess certain priority reading and mathematics skills appropriate to different grade levels. Due to the difficulty of this task, progress has been slow and assessment results must still be regarded as somewhat developmental and tentative in nature. For this school system, the best and most comprehensive source of information concerning achievement in the basic skills is provided by the Countywide Assessment program. This program utilizes the Stanford Achievement Test, a nationally-standardized test published by the Harcourt, Brace Company. The Stanford test itself is highly regarded by most curriculum and testing personnel and is now in its fifth revision (1973), having been first published in 1923.

As a standardized test, however, the Stanford has its limitations. The logic of a standardized test is based upon comparing an individual pupil or a given group of pupils to some national sample. As such, then, one can never definitively determine whether or not a pupil can "really" read or compute adequately but only how well he/she performs compared to a national sample. Also, because of the very construction of a standardized or norm-referenced test, half of the population of any school or group must be both above and below grade level, if their performance is comparable to that of the national sample.

Given these limitations, an analysis of the results for the Dade County Schools would reveal that the school system is generally performing, as a whole, slightly below the national average. The average of the school system, however, is equal to or surpasses that of the national sample for mathematics in the elementary grades and for reading in the first two grades.

* Additional information in this area may be found in the following document published by the Evaluation Field Services Office in November of each year: Achievement in Dade County Public Schools, 1973-74.

DADE COUNTY PUPIL PERFORMANCE
ON THE STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT TEST FOR 1973-74 *

	"Old" Stanford (1963)			"New" Stanford (1973)		
	Reading	Nat. Norm	Math	Reading	Nat. Norm	Math
<u>Elementary Schools</u>						
Grade One	1.95**	1.8	2.05**	1.78	1.8	2.09**
Two	2.80**	2.8	3.08**	2.67	2.8	3.11**
Three	3.55	3.8	3.97**	3.67	3.8	4.24**
Four	4.30	4.8	4.92**	4.35	4.8	5.24**
Five	5.43	5.8	6.01**	5.55	5.8	6.42**
Six	6.37	6.8	7.09**	6.58	6.8	7.41**
<u>Secondary Schools</u>						
Grade Seven	7.44	7.8	7.56	39.08	50%ile	43.18
Eight	8.38	8.8	8.53	40.74	50	43.92
Nine	9.09	9.8	9.19	42.99	50	43.95
Ten	9.94	10.8	9.32	44.77	50	47.04
Eleven	11.44	11.8	10.99	43.76	50	49.99
Twelve	12.27	12.8	12.00	41.97	50	47.88

* Scores are mean grade-equivalents with the exception of secondary scores on the New Stanford which are in mean percentiles.

** Denotes school system average performance at or above the national norm.

Another way to examine the performance of the system as a whole is to examine the number of pupils tested who either performed very well or very poorly. For purposes of this analysis, the arbitrary point of two grade levels above and below the national norm has been chosen as the benchmark. As one can note from the chart on the following page, there are large numbers of pupils who perform in each of the categories.

Ultimately, the problem of achievement in the basic skills can be adequately analyzed only on an individual pupil basis. For pupil performance is influenced by the quality of school programming, teaching skill, pupil ability and aspiration, and parental cooperation. The Dade County Schools has acknowledged a general dissatisfaction with performance in this area and has developed and will continue to offer countywide programs addressed to this need.

NUMBERS BY GRADE OF PUPILS SCORING TWO OR MORE YEARS ABOVE OR BELOW GRADE LEVEL FOR 1973-74 ON THE "OLD" STANFORD

Grade	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
<u>Reading: Total Number Tested</u>	6699	7820	8937	9723	9465	10054	8292	7938	8667	8877	7776	5517
<u>Number Scoring Two or More Years Above Grade Level</u>	326	414	596	924	1089	1585	1472	1916	1489	2264	2537	1584
<u>Number Scoring Two or More Years Below Grade Level</u>	156*	32*	669	1692	2261	3039	2481	2824	3733	3762	3034	2212
<u>Math: Total Number Tested</u>	6798	7797	8940	9704	9458	10043	8189	7925	8641	8893	7787	5518
<u>Number Scoring Two or More Years Above Grade Level</u>	113	228	785	1246	1051	1953	1459	1685	2081	2494	2360	1633
<u>Number Scoring Two or More Years Below Grade Level</u>	106*	106**	273	676	855	1310	1931	2722	3608	4177	3582	2385

* Number attaining a score of 1.0, the lowest possible grade.

** Number attaining a score of 1.2, the lowest grade attained in grade two math.

DESIGN OF THE SURVEY

The purposes of the Needs Assessment Survey were twofold. In addition to providing another source of information for the School Board and the administration for use in the budgetary decisionmaking process, the Dade County Public School System is required by law to prepare annually a five-year comprehensive educational plan which must include an assessment of the system's priority needs and a program of action for meeting the identified needs. Of the several steps involved in the needs assessment process, one of the most important is that of gathering the opinions of informed and involved persons regarding problems facing the school system, possible solutions to problems, and priorities among educational programs. This report will become a part of the Needs Assessment section of the District Comprehensive Educational Plan: Fiscal Years 1975-80.

Specifically, the Needs Assessment Survey was designed to collect information from seven groups of respondents regarding the following four areas:

- Priorities as to the relative seriousness of fifteen identified possible problems facing the Dade County Public Schools, with an open-ended question to detect any other important problems.
- Priorities as to the importance of seventeen broad program areas.
- Perceptions as to the degree of importance of thirty-four possible solutions to problems, with an open-ended question to collect other recommendations for solutions.
- Priorities for funding for six areas of capital construction needs, with a question to elicit responses as to the desirability of strict adherence to a priority listing of means of meeting construction needs.

The respondent groups were:

- County/Area/School Advisory Committee Members, including The County Comprehensive Planning Advisory Committee, the six Area Advisory Committees and the seventy school advisory committees associated with the Rockefeller project.
- Other Participating Community or School Related Groups, including The Dade County PIA Executive Board, the Education Committee of The League of Women Voters, The Human Resources Committee of the Greater Miami Chamber of Commerce, the General Vocational/Adult Advisory Committee and the chairperson of each Vocational/Adult Education Craft Advisory Committee.

- Secondary School Principals/Assistant Principals, including administrators of special centers, adult center principals and community school coordinators.
- Elementary School Principals/Assistant Principals/Administrative Assistants.
- Secondary School Teachers, including counselors, media specialists, department chairmen and other school-location professional staff members, as well as those classified as secondary teachers on special assignment or visiting teachers. Also included those full-time adult education teachers whose assignment is secondary or post-secondary.
- Elementary School Teachers, including school-location professional personnel as well as those classified as elementary teachers on special assignment or visiting teachers. Also included any full-time adult education teacher whose assignment involves primarily elementary adult basic courses.
- County/Area Administrators, including all area and county administrators associated with or involved in the instructional aspects of the school system such as directors, supervisors, coordinators, consultants, project managers, psychologists, and specialists, including vocational and adult education administrators.

Construction of the Survey Instrument. Educational needs assessment surveys are conducted from time to time throughout this state and the nation. The most publicized is the annual Gallup Poll which surveys opinions as to the perception of problems, possible solutions to problems and other educational priorities on a nationwide basis.* In order for the results of a survey to be useful for local decisionmaking, however, the results must be interpretable in terms of the needs of a particular school-district. Hence, an instrument was constructed for this survey which involved those issues relevant to the Dade County Schools and was designed in such a manner as to cause respondents to view problems and programs in their proper perspective to others, so that choices were clear and so that priorities could be enumerated. (See page 54, The Survey Instrument.)

Problems and possible solutions were identified through several means which included a review of previously conducted similar surveys, an analysis of problems and recommendations for solutions submitted by advisory committees, and from the experience and knowledge of school system program managers and other administrators. A preliminary listing was prepared and refined through administrative review and through administering an early draft of the instrument to a pilot group made up of advisory committee members. The broad program areas prioritized were selected through the same process.

* Kappan, "Sixth Annual Gallup Poll of Public Attitude Toward Education", September, 1974.

Administration of the Survey Instrument. The survey instruments were distributed through designated contact persons with written instructions for responding to the form and for returning it. Responses were voluntary and anonymous. Approximately one-month was allowed between distribution and collection of the forms.

Analysis of the Data. The responses were analyzed by standard methods, utilizing electronic data processing techniques, except for responses to two open-ended questions which were analyzed more subjectively.

For those sections of the survey in which respondents were asked to rank order a list of items, e.g., Problems, Broad Program Areas and Construction Needs, mean rankings were computed and the items were then ranked according to these means for each group and for the composite of all of the respondent groups.

The section in which respondents were asked to respond to the degree of importance of selected solutions to problems on a five-point scale was treated slightly differently. Instead of reporting mean rankings, as in the other categories, a derived ranking is reported, based upon the means of the collective responses to the five possible choices to each item.

For each of the four sections (Program Areas, Problems, Solutions to Problems and Construction Needs), a comparative ranking chart is presented. An individual chart for each of the groups depicts the rank order of the items as reported by that group, as well as a partial distribution of responses reported in percents, for the Problems, Program Areas, and Construction Needs sections.

The top five problems, as determined from the responses of the composite group, were identified. The Planning Department researched these top five problems and compiled related data in order to demonstrate the magnitude and depth of the problems in the Dade County schools.

Responses to two open-ended questions were also analyzed. Respondents were asked to enumerate any additional problems not included in the list of fifteen problems presented. They were also asked to augment the list of possible solutions to problems by suggesting additional solutions and stating their degree of importance, e.g., critical, very important etc., These responses were compiled subjectively. Those written responses dealing with items already addressed in the survey instrument were eliminated. The report of these analyses is included in the Overview of Findings section of the report.

Limitations of the Study. Since the survey involved only the above selected groups of informed and involved respondents, it is not intended that the results accurately summarize the collective opinions or a representative sample of all the constituents of the school system.

It is also recognized that collective responses analyzed primarily by arithmetic means cannot serve as an absolute determination of priorities of needs. Such data should serve as one source of information, viewed in proper perspective along with other information, to assist in making sound educational decisions. The responsibility for decisionmaking by the administration and the School Board cannot be delegated to a survey.

EMPHASIS ON SOLUTIONS TO PROBLEMS. *

Comparison of Mean Ranking by Groups

Item	Item No.	Composite All Groups	Advisory Committees	Other Community Groups	County/Area Administrators	Sec. Principals/ Assistants	Elem. Principals/ Assistants	Secondary Teachers	Elementary Teachers
Increased emphasis on prevention/control of student misbehavior.	3	1	10	4	3	2	5	2	1
Improve basic skills competencies by expanding reading and math programs at all levels.	10	2	1	1	1	1	2	1	4
Allocate additional personnel to schools to assure appropriate pupil-teacher ratios.	5	3	4	6	11	8	1	5	2
Increase emphasis on attracting, hiring, retaining "good" teachers.	6	4	2	2	2	5	4	3	6
Maintain a balance in the curriculum by increasing emphasis on basic education such as math, science, social studies, language arts.	27	5	3	3	8	6	3	4	8
Relieve overcrowding in schools by constructing additional schools.	18	6	5	8	6	3	9	6	5
Improve maintenance and repairs on existing schools.	19	7	6	7	7	4	6	7	11
Improve student achievement by providing more assistance for teachers.	11	8	13	11	17	15	7	12	3
Insure that every student is given the opportunity to develop saleable vocational skills.	13	9	7	9	5	7	12	8	10

* Respondents rated their perceptions as to the importance of 34 possible solutions to problems. The 34 solutions were then ranked by the mean of the responses so that the most favored was given a rank of 1.

Comparison of Mean Ranking by Groups

Item	Item No.	Composite All Groups	Advisory Committees	Other Community Groups	County/Area Administrators	Sec. Principals/ Assistants	Elem. Principals/ Assistants	Secondary Teachers	Elementary Teachers
Increase availability of quality instructional materials/equipment/media.	4	10	12	12	16	13	16	9	9
Improve mastery of the basic skills through expanding implementation of individualized programs.	9	11	9	5	4	9	8	10	13
Insure that all non-English speaking pupils master basic communication skills in English by expanding and improving the ESOL program.	15	12	8	10	13	11	14	11	12
Expand and improve the program for identification, placement and instruction of special education students.	24	13	14	13	10	19	10	15	7
Expand security services.	20	14	21	18	19	14	20	14	14
Increase competencies of management.	31	15	16	15	9	10	15	13	17
Provide additional curriculum/instructional support services to teachers.	2	16	15	17	14	16	13	16	15
Provide for needs of the economically and culturally disadvantaged by expanding local compensatory education programs.	25	17	19	19	20	24	21	20	16
Increase decisionmaking at the school level by providing for more discretionary use of resources.	12	18	18	20	25	12	11	19	19

Comparison of Mean Ranking by Groups.

Item	Item No.	Composite All Groups	Advisory Committees	Other Community Groups	County/Area Administrators	Sec. Principals/ Assistants	Elem. Principals/ Assistants	Secondary Teachers	Elementary Teachers
Raise competency level of teachers by improving the Staff Development program.	1	19	11	14	12	18	18	25	22
Improve program decision-making by providing more indepth evaluations of specific programs.	28	20	20	28	15	17	19	23	20
Increase opportunities for job training or retraining for adults.	33	21	26	21	21	22	22	18	25
Respond to societal problems (drug abuse, alcoholism, etc.) by expanding the Comprehensive Health Education program.	17	22	22	16	27	27	24	21	21
Increase the dissemination of occupational and vocational education information.	34	23	25	24	22	20	26	17	27
Expand the Elementary Counseling program.	7	24	23	22	24	28	17	28	18
Expand the Career Awareness Career Exploratory programs at elementary/junior high levels.	29	25	24	23	18	23	23	26	24
Expand and improve adult basic and adult vocational programs.	23	26	28	25	23	21	25	24	28
Improve and expand placement and follow-up services.	14	27	30	27	26	29	30	27	26

Comparison of Mean Ranking by Groups

Item	Item No.	Composite ATL Groups	Advisory Committees	Other Community Groups	County/Area Administrators	Sec. Principals/ Assistants	Elem. Principals/ Assistants	Secondary Teachers	Elementary Teachers
Maintain a balance in the curriculum by expanding art, music and other electives in the elementary schools.	26	28	31	30	31	32	33	29	23
Increase emphasis on consumer education.	32	29	29	31	28	25	28	22	30
Continue to expand the Community School program.	22	30	27	29	32	31	27	31	29
Increase participation of the community through an improved or expanded community advisory committee structure.	21	31	17	26	30	30	32	30	31
Develop a program of educational options.	30	32	33	33	29	26	31	32	32
Insure that all non-Spanish speaking pupils are given the voluntary opportunity to learn to speak and write Spanish.	16	33	32	32	33	33	29	33	33
Expand implementation of the elementary Quin- mester curriculum.	8	34	34	34	34	34	34	34	34

ANALYSES OF ITEMS FOR EACH RESPONDENT GROUP AND
COMPOSITE OF ALL GROUPS FOR
PROBLEMS, PROGRAM AREAS AND CAPITAL CONSTRUCTION NEEDS

PROBLEMS *
COMPOSITE OF ALL CATEGORIES

Number
Responding 9,837

Number who are parents
of students in DCPS 3,000

Rank	Item	Item #	Mean Rank	Ranking Item as #1	% Ranking Item in Top Five	% Ranking Item in Bottom Five	% Responding to Item
1	General Discipline	1	4.10	28.0	73	8	99.4
2	Severe/Repeated Misbehavior	2	4.75	12.0	68	8	99.2
3	Class Size	4	5.14	14.4	63	11	99.2
4	Overcrowded Schools	3	5.57	10.9	58	13	99.0
5	Achievement/Basic Skills	11	5.96	11.2	50	13	90.0
6	Special Needs of Students	9	6.58	6.9	42	16	98.8
7	Finances-Operating Curriculum Adaptability	7	8.02	5.8	28	29	98.6
8	Public Attitude	10	8.58	2.3	22	34	98.5
9	Curriculum Balance	14	9.05	2.3	21	39	98.8
10	Finances-Capital Competency of Teachers	15	9.29	1.1	17	40	98.7
11	Substance Abuse	6	9.57	1.5	17	46	98.5
12	Integration	12	9.74	2.3	19	48	98.6
13	Racial/Ethnic Discrimination	5	10.40	1.1	13	56	98.4
14		8	11.29	1.3	9	67	98.2
15		13	11.36	.9	8	68	98.5

* Most serious problem ranked as number 1.

PROBLEMS*
COUNTY, AREA, SCHOOL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Number
Responding 478

Number who are parents
of students in DCPS 386

Rank	Item	Item #	Mean Rank	% Ranking Item as #1	% Ranking Item in Top Five	% Ranking Item in Bottom Five	% Responding to Item
1	Achievement/Basic Skills	11	5.23	18.7	60	12	97.5
2	General Discipline	1	5.76	18.1	54	17	98.1
3	Overcrowded Schools	3	5.88	11.9	53	15	96.7
4	Class Size	4	6.15	8.9	49	16	96.7
5	Special Needs of Students	9	6.36	8.2	44	13	97.5
6	Severe/Repeated Misbehavior	2	6.75	4.3	42	18	97.9
7	Competency of Teachers	12	7.39	7.9	43	30	97.5
8	Finances-Operating	7	7.74	7.6	29	30	96.4
9	Curriculum Adaptability	10	8.02	3.9	28	31	96.7
10	Finances-Capital	6	8.62	2.2	26	39	96.7
11	Curriculum Balance	15	8.98	2.8	23	39	97.3
12	Substance Abuse	5	9.76	3.5	20	52	96.9
13	Public Attitude	14	9.94	1.7	17	50	96.9
14	Racial/Ethnic Discrimination	13	11.13	2.0	10	64	96.4
15	Integration	8	11.24	2.2	11	67	96.4

* Most serious problem ranked as number 1.

PROBLEMS*
OTHER COMMUNITY OR SCHOOL RELATED GROUPS

Number
Responding 267

Number who are parents
of students in DCPS 151

Rank	Item	Item #	Mean Rank	% Ranking Item as #1	% Ranking Item in Top Five	% Ranking Item in Bottom Five	% Responding to Item
1	General Discipline	1	4.71	24.9	64	8	99.3
2	Overcrowded Schools	3	5.85	14.8	55	15	98.5
3	Achievement/Basic Skills	11	5.90	12.2	51	15	98.9
4	Class Size	4	5.94	8.3	54	16	99.3
5	Severe/Repeated Misbehavior	2	6.05	7.2	52	15	98.5
6	Special Needs of Students	9	6.88	7.2	41	23	98.9
7	Competency of Teachers	12	7.76	4.2	37	32	98.5
8	Finances-Operating	7	8.11	5.4	28	29	97.4
9	Curriculum Adaptability	10	8.83	2.7	19	35	98.5
10	Curriculum Balance	15	9.10	1.9	18	38	98.1
11	Finances-Capital	6	9.18	3.1	22	45	97.8
12	Substance Abuse	5	9.49	3.4	21	48	98.1
13	Public Attitude	14	9.59	1.1	19	47	98.5
14	Racial/Ethnic Discrimination	13	11.01	1.9	13	66	98.5
15	Integration	8	11.22	1.9	11	64	97.8

* Most serious problem ranked as number 1.

PROBLEMS*
COUNTY/AREA ADMINISTRATORS

Number Responding 208

Number who are parents of students in DCPS 86

Rank	Item	Item #	Mean Rank	% Ranking Item as #1	% Ranking Item in Top Five	% Ranking Item in Bottom Five	% Responding to Item
1	General Discipline	1	5.51	16.9	57	14	99.5
2	Special Needs of Students	9	5.86	11.5	50	12	100.0
3	Achievement/Basic Skills	11	6.29	12.0	49	16	100.0
4	Overcrowded Schools	3	6.33	9.1	48	16	100.0
5	Severe/Repeated Misbehavior	2	6.44	6.3	45	15	100.0
6	Finances-Operating Curriculum Adapt-ability	7	6.52	16.3	41	20	100.0
8	Class Size	10	7.06	6.3	38	22	100.0
9	Competency of Teachers	4	7.43	6.7	37	25	100.0
10	Finances-Capital Construction	12	7.58	2.9	37	30	100.0
11	Public Attitude	6	8.53	2.9	27	34	100.0
12	Curriculum Balance	14	8.68	3.4	27	37	100.0
13	Racial/Ethnic Discrimination	15	8.90	3.4	26	40	100.0
14	Substance Abuse	13	11.30	1.0	8	68	100.0
15	Integration	5	11.33	1.4	8	71	99.5
		8	11.94	2.0	4	76	98.6

* Most serious problem assigned a rank of 1.

PROBLEMS
SECONDARY PRINCIPALS/ASSISTANTS

Number
Responding 228

Number who are parents
of students in DCPS 97

Rank	Item	Item #	Mean Rank	Ranking Item as #1	% Ranking Item in Top Five	% Ranking Item in Bottom Five	% Responding to Item
1	Severe/Repeated Misbehavior	2	4.53	19.7	67	8	100.0
2	General Discipline	1	4.64	21.9	67	9	100.0
3	Achievement/Basic Skills	11	5.86	9.6	50	9	100.0
4	Overcrowded Schools	3	6.10	14.1	51	17	99.6
5	Special Needs of Students	9	6.39	8.8	44	17	100.0
6	Class Size	4	7.39	3.9	35	23	100.0
7	Finances-Operating	7	7.60	4.4	34	25	100.0
8	Curriculum-Adaptability	10	7.64	3.5	32	29	99.6
9	Finances-Capital	6	8.31	2.6	27	36	100.0
10	Public Attitude	14	8.64	4.8	27	38	100.0
11	Competency of Teachers	12	8.85	3.9	25	36	100.0
12	Curriculum Balance	15	9.39	1.8	18	43	100.0
13	Substance Abuse	5	11.13	.9	10	67	99.6
14	Integration	8	11.38	1.3	10	66	99.6
15	Racial/Ethnic Discrimination	13	11.54	0.0	9	73	100.0

* Most serious problem ranked as number 1.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA DO HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THE FOLLOWING IS A TRUE AND CORRECT COPY OF THE REPORT AS FILED IN THE OFFICE OF THE STATE ARCHIVIST.

Item No.	Description	Quantity	Unit Price	Total Price	Remarks
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100

NOT RECORDED IN THE OFFICE OF THE STATE ARCHIVIST

PROBLEMS *
SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS

Number Responding 4,094

Number who are parents of students in DCPS 1,003

Rank	Item	Mean Rank	Ranking Item as #1	% Ranking Item in Top Five	% Ranking Item in Bottom Five	Responding to Item
1	General Discipline's	4.01	20.9	74	7	99.4
2	Mothers/Repeated Misbehavior	4.47	14.3	71	7	99.3
3	Overcrowded Schools	4.49	13.0	58	12	99.1
4	Achievement/Dance Skills	5.65	13.7	54	12	99.1
5	Class Size	5.82	6.7	54	13	99.2
6	Special Needs of Students	6.96	6.0	37	19	98.8
7	Financial-Operating	7.90	6.3	29	29	98.7
8	Curriculum Adaptability	8.67	2.5	23	37	98.6
9	Public Attitude	9.03	2.4	22	40	98.6
10	Financial Capital	9.38	1.5	18	43	98.6
11	Substance Abuse	9.65	1.0	16	46	98.6
12	Curriculum Balance	9.67	.0	14	44	98.7
13	Competency of Teachers	10.10	1.5	16	52	98.6
14	Integration	11.20	1.4	10	66	98.3
15	Racial/Ethnic Discrimination	11.35	.0	8	68	98.5

* Most serious problem ranked as number 1.

**PROBLEMS *
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL TEACHERS**

Number Responding 4,132

Number who are parents of students in DCPS 1,044

Rank	Item	Item #	Mean Rank	% Ranking Item as #1	% Ranking Item in Top Five	% Ranking Item in Bottom Five	Responding to Item
1	General Discipline	1	3.77	29.7	77	6	99.6
2	Class Size	4	4.01	24.1	76	6	99.5
3	Severe/Repeated Misbehavior	2	4.55	11.0	70	6	99.3
4	Overcrowded Schools	3	5.41	8.0	61	11	99.1
5	Special Need of Students	9	6.32	7.0	45	13	99.1
6	Achievement/Basic Skills	11	6.33	7.8	44	13	99.2
7	Finance-Operating	7	8.29	4.3	26	31	98.9
8	Curriculum Adaptability	10	8.73	1.5	19	33	98.6
9	Public Attitude	14	9.03	2.1	21	38	98.9
10	Curriculum Balance	15	9.08	.9	17	36	98.8
11	Competency of Teachers	12	10.05	2.1	15	50	98.6
12	Finance-Capital	6	10.10	.8	12	51	98.7
13	Substance Abuse	5	11.29	.9	8	63	98.6
14	Integration	8	11.35	1.0	9	68	98.3
15	Racial/Ethnic Discrimination	13	11.41	.6	7	69	98.5

37

43

* Most serious problem ranked as number 1.

PRIORITIES OF PROGRAM AREAS*
COMPOSITE OF ALL CATEGORIES

Number Responding 9,837

Number who are parents of students in DCPS 3,000

Rank	Item	Item #	Mean Rank	% Ranking Item as #1	% Ranking Item in Top Five	% Ranking Item in Bottom Five	% Responding to Item
1	General Knowledge	1	3.99	27.6	76	4	99.0
2	Basic Skills	5	5.15	17.2	63	7	98.9
3	Attitudes/Values	7	5.70	11.2	57	7	98.8
4	Effective Citizenship	10	6.20	9.0	52	10	98.6
5	Prevention/Treatment	17	6.47	15.1	50	14	98.7
6	Misbehavior	3	6.85	5.8	46	13	98.7
7	Saleable Voc. Skills	2	9.38	1.8	26	30	98.3
8	College Preparation	16	9.39	2.2	22	28	98.3
9	Career Education (Elem., Jr. High)	11	9.41	3.2	21	28	98.1
10	Exceptional Child Education	4	9.78	1.2	16	27	98.1
11	Physical/Health Education	12	9.79	2.1	19	31	98.4
12	Compensatory Education (Local)	15	10.32	1.0	14	35	98.3
13	Family Living/Consumer Education	8	10.58	.6	12	36	98.1
14	Environmental Education	6	11.29	1.1	10	44	98.1
15	Aesthetics/Fine Arts	13	12.01	.8	9	54	98.0
16	Adult Education	14	12.53	.6	6	59	98.1
17	Community Schools	9	12.98	2.0	10	65	98.0
17	Bilingual Education						

* Most important program area ranked as number 1.

PRIORITIES OF PROGRAM AREAS*
COUNTY, AREA, SCHOOL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Number Responding 478

Number who are parents of students in DCPS 386

Rank	Item	Item #	Mean Rank	Ranking Item as #1	% Ranking Item in Top Five	% Ranking Item in Bottom Five	% Responding to Item
1	General Knowledge	1	3.52	41.6	80	3	97.1
2	Basic Skills	5	5.40	15.6	60	8	97.3
3	Attitudes/Values	7	6.47	6.7	49	11	96.7
4	Effective Citizenship	10	6.54	6.9	46	10	96.9
5	Saleable Voc. Skills	3	6.93	4.5	44	13	97.3
6	College Preparation	2	8.11	3.4	39	24	97.1
7	Prevention/Treatment						
8	Misbehavior	17	8.44	5.6	34	28	96.9
9	Exceptional Child Education	11	8.77	4.6	28	25	96.2
10	Career Education (Elem., Jr. High)	16	9.19	3.7	25	29	96.0
11	Compensatory Education (Local)	12	9.99	2.8	19	33	96.7
12	Environmental Education	8	10.05	.7	15	28	96.2
13	Physical/Health Education	4	10.06	1.5	16	30	96.0
14	Family Living/Consumer Education	15	10.35	.7	13	36	96.2
15	Aesthetics/Fine Arts	6	11.37	.2	9	43	96.4
16	Adult Education	13	11.86	.4	10	52	96.4
17	Bilingual Education	9	12.25	4.1	17	60	97.3
	Community Schools	14	12.26	.9	7	58	96.0

* Most important program area ranked as number 1.



PRIORITIES OF PROGRAM AREAS
OTHER COMMUNITY OR SCHOOL RELATED GROUPS

Number
Responding 267

Number who are parents
of students in DCPS 151

Rank	Item	Item #	Mean Rank	% Ranking Item as #1	% Ranking Item in Top Five	% Ranking Item in Bottom Five	% Responding to Item
1	General Knowledge	1	3.25	40.4	82	3	97.4
2	Basic Skills	5	5.87	9.5	58	10	98.1
3	Saleable Voc. Skills	3	6.51	9.6	50	14	97.4
4	Attitudes/Values	7	6.55	7.7	48	9	97.8
5	Effective Citizenship	10	6.75	5.0	45	11	97.4
6	Prevention/Treatment						
7	Misbehavior	17	6.86	13.8	49	18	97.8
8	Career Education (Elem., Jr. High)	16	8.58	3.5	29	21	97.0
9	College Preparation	2	8.78	1.5	31	25	97.4
10	Exceptional Child Education	11	9.10	6.2	25	28	97.4
11	Compensatory Education (Local)	12	9.99	2.7	19	34	97.0
12	Physical/Health Education	4	10.16	.4	11	28	97.4
13	Family Living/Consumer Education	15	10.45	.4	13	34	97.0
14	Environmental Education	8	11.01	.4	9	42	97.0
15	Adult Education	13	11.18	1.2	13	49	96.6
16	Community Schools	14	11.61	.4	9	50	97.0
17	Aesthetics/Fine Arts	6	11.90	.4	8	49	97.0
	Bilingual Education	9	12.75	2.7	12	62	97.4

* Most important program area ranked as number 1.

PRIORITIES OF PROGRAM AREAS*
AREA/COUNTY ADMINISTRATORS

Number
Responding 208
Number who are
Parents of students
in DCPS 86

Rank	Item	Item #	Mean Rank	% Ranking Item as #1	% Ranking Item in Top Five	% Ranking Item in Bottom Five	% Responding to Item
1	General Knowledge	1	3.78	26.4	74	1	100.0
2	Basic Skills	5	3.86	24.2	78	2	99.5
3	Attitudes/Values	7	5.76	13.0	56	7	100.0
4	Affective Citizenship	10	5.91	19.0	56	9	99.5
5	Saleable Voc. Skills	3	6.22	9.7	50	11	99.5
6	Prevention/Treatment						
7	Misbehavior	17	7.18	6.3	39	12	99.5
8	Exceptional Child Education	11	8.32	6.7	27	17	100.0
9	Career Education (Elem. Jr. High)	16	8.78	2.4	28	22	99.5
10	College Preparation	2	9.42	0	18	26	99.5
11	Compensatory Education (Local)	12	9.90	1.9	18	32	100.0
12	Physical/Health Education	4	10.73	.5	10	36	100.0
13	Family Living/Consumer Education	15	11.00	.5	11	38	99.5
14	Aesthetic/Fine Arts	6	11.57	1.4	10	50	99.5
15	Environmental Education	8	11.60	.5	6	46	99.5
16	Adult Education	13	11.63	0	11	52	99.0
17	Bilingual Education	9	13.01	1.5	9	63	99.0
	Community Schools	14	13.54	0	3	71	99.5

* Most important program area ranked as number 1.

PRIORITIES OF PROGRAM AREAS*
SECONDARY PRINCIPALS/ASSISTANTS

Number
Responding 228

Number who are
parents of students
in DCPS 97

Rank	Item	Item #	Rank	Ranking Item as #1	% Ranking Item in Top Five	% Ranking Item in Bottom Five	% Responding to Item
1	General Knowledge	1	3.57	28.9	79	1	100.0
2	Basic Skills	5	4.54	18.4	67	3	100.0
3	Attitudes/Values	7	4.69	12.7	67	2	100.0
4	Saleable Voc. Skills	3	5.35	8.3	62	4	100.0
5	Effective Citizenship	10	5.56	11.0	61	7	100.0
6	Prevention/Treatment						
7	Misbehavior	17	6.82	12.7	43	12	100.0
8	Career Education (Elem. Jr. High)	16	8.30	1.8	31	21	99.6
9	College Preparation	2	9.43	.9	22	28	99.1
10	Family Living						
11	Consumer Education	15	10.40	.4	9	33	99.6
12	Physical/Health Education	4	10.43	.4	10	32	99.6
13	Compensatory Education (Local)						
14	Exceptional Child Education	12	10.52	.4	11	36	99.6
15	Environmental Education	11	10.93	1.3	9	37	98.2
16	Adult Education	8	11.42	0	6	42	98.7
17	Aesthetics/Fine Arts	13	11.73	1.8	9	52	99.1
18	Community Schools	6	11.92	0	4	46	99.6
19	Bilingual Education	14	12.70	1.3	8	63	99.6
20		9	13.62	.9	6	70	98.7

* Most important program area ranked as number 1.

PRIORITIES OF PROGRAM AREAS*
ELEMENTARY PRINCIPALS/ASSISTANTS

Number Responding 287

Number who are parents of students in DCPS 97

Rank	Item	Item #	Mean Rank	% Ranking Item as #1	% Ranking Item in TOP Five	% Ranking Item in Bottom Five	% Responding to Item
1	Basic Skills	5	3.32	30.9	83	1	99.3
2	General Knowledge	1	3.51	27.1	84	3	99.0
3	Attitudes/Values	7	4.90	9.8	68	3	99.3
4	Effective Citizenship	10	5.53	9.5	61	6	98.6
5	Prevention/Treatment						
6	Misbehavior	17	6.24	10.5	52	10	99.3
7	Saleable Voc. Skills	3	7.97	2.1	29	15	98.6
8	Exceptional Child Education	11	8.36	1.4	28	18	98.3
9	Compensatory Education (local)	12	9.44	3.2	22	30	99.3
10	Career Education (Elem., Jr. High)	16	9.52	2.1	19	25	99.3
11	Physical/Health Education	4	9.66	.7	12	19	98.6
12	Family Living/Consumer Education	15	10.95	.4	9	39	99.3
13	College Preparation	2	10.99	.7	12	41	99
14	Aesthetics/Fine Arts	6	11.22	.4	8	43	98.3
15	Environmental Education	8	11.37	.7	4	43	99.0
16	Community Schools	14	12.68	.4	5	62	98.6
17	Bilingual Education	9	12.76	1.1	8	61	98.3
18	Adult Education	13	13.26	.7	5	68	98.3

* Most important program area ranked as number 1.

PRIORITIES OF PROGRAM AREAS*
SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS

Number Responding 4,094

Number who are parents of students in DCPS 1,083

Rank	Item	Item #	Mean Rank	Ranking Item as #1	Item in Top Five	Item in Bottom Five	% Responding to Item
1	General Knowledge	1	4.13	25.5	74	4	99.0
2	Basic Skills	5	5.15	16.4	62	6	99.0
3	Saleable Voc. Skills	3	5.53	9.1	60	7	99.0
4	Attitudes/Values	7	5.83	10.6	56	8	98.9
5	Effective Citizenship	10	6.14	9.9	52	9	98.9
6	Prevention/Treatment						
7	Misbehavior	17	6.89	15.0	46	16	98.9
8	College Preparation	2	8.50	2.2	31	23	98.5
9	Career Education (Elem., Jr. High)	16	8.99	2.8	25	26	98.4
10	Family Living/Consumer Education	15	9.99	1.1	15	30	98.4
11	Physical/Health Education	4	10.06	1.4	15	30	98.2
12	Compensatory Education (Local)	12	10.53	1.1	13	37	98.4
13	Exceptional Child Education	11	10.57	1.7	12	37	98.0
14	Environmental Education	8	10.64	.8	12	36	98.2
15	Aesthetics/Fine Arts	6	11.33	1.5	11	44	98.1
16	Adult Education	13	11.54	1.2	11	50	98.3
17	Community Schools	14	12.75	.5	6	62	98.1
	Bilingual Education	9	13.16	1.3	8	66	98.0

* Most important program area ranked as number 1.

PRIORITIES OF PROGRAM AREAS*
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL TEACHERS

Number
Responding 4,132

Number who are parents
of students in DCPS 1,044

Rank	Item	Item #	Mean Rank	Ranking Item as #1	% Ranking Item in Top Five	% Ranking Item in Bottom Five	Responding to Item
1	General Knowledge	1	4.02	27.1	76	4	99.2
2	Basic Skills	5	5.27	17.2	62	8	99.0
3	Attitude/Values	7	5.49	12.4	60	7	99.1
4	Prevention/Treatment						
5	Misbehavior	17	5.77	17.4	57	10	99.0
6	Effective Citizenship	10	6.27	8.5	52	11	98.7
7	Saleable Voc. Skills	3	8.20	2.4	33	20	98.5
	Exceptional Child Education	11	8.40	4.4	29	20	98.5
8	Compensatory Education (Local)	12	9.05	2.8	25	26	98.5
9	Physical/Health Education	4	9.36	1.2	19	24	98.3
10	Career Education (Elem., Jr. High)	16	9.95	1.3	17	31	98.5
11	College Preparation	2	10.32	1.5	20	38	98.2
12	Environmental Education	8	10.42	.3	13	34	98.4
13	Family Living/Consumer Education	15	10.55	.9	14	38	98.4
14	Aesthetics/Fine Arts	6	11.14	1.1	10	43	98.4
15	Community Schools	14	12.37	.6	6	57	98.4
16	Adult Education	13	12.51	.3	5	59	98.1
17	Bilingual Education	9	12.93	2.6	10	63	98.3

* Most important program area ranked as number 1.

PRIORITIES OF CAPITAL CONSTRUCTION NEEDS
COMPOSITE OF ALL CATEGORIES

Number
Responding 9,837

Number who are parents
of students in DCPS 3,000

Rank	Item	Item #	Mean Rank	% Ranking Item as #1	% Ranking Item in Top Two	% Ranking Item in Bottom Two	% Responding to Item
1	Aircondition Schools	1	2.91	32.7	51	25	96.5
2	Eliminate Double Sessions	4	3.27	26.9	43	33	96.4
3	Replace Obsolete Schools	5	3.36	13.4	34	27	96.3
4	Renovate/Adapt Existing Facilities	6	3.51	10.1	29	29	96.4
5	Additional Vocational Facilities	2	3.86	12.7	27	43	96.4
6	Maintain/Improve Existing Schools	3	3.99	5.9	19	42	96.2

Should strict adherence to priorities be observed?

n	Yes	No	No Response
	4,945	4,136	756
%	50.3	42.1	7.6

PRIORITIES OF CAPITAL CONSTRUCTION NEEDS
 COUNTY, AREA, SCHOOL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Number Responding 478

Number who are parents of students in DCPS 386

Rank	Item	Item #	Mean Rank	% Ranking Item as #1	% Ranking Item in Top Two	% Ranking Item in Bottom Two	% Responding to Item
1	Eliminate Double Sessions	4	3.15	32.5	45	31	94.8
2	Aircondition Schools	1	3.33	24.0	42	33	95.2
3	Replace Obsolete Schools	5	3.38	13.0	32	27	94.8
4	Renovate/Adapt Existing Schools	6	3.51	9.5	30	29	95.2
5	Maintain/Improve Existing Facilities	3	3.67	9.3	27	34	94.8
6	Additional Vocational Facilities	2	3.87	14.1	27	44	95.2

Should strict adherence to priorities be observed?

	Yes	No	No Response
n	226	218	34
%	47.3	45.6	7.1

PRIORITIES OF CAPITAL CONSTRUCTION NEEDS
COUNTY/AREA ADMINISTRATORS

Number
Responding 208

Number who are parents
of students in DCPS 86

Rank	Item	Item #	Mean Rank	% Ranking Item as #1	% Ranking Item in Top Two	% Ranking Item in Bottom Two	% Responding to Item
1	Eliminate Double Sessions	4	2.87	30.4	51	22	98.1
2	Replace Obsolete Schools	5	2.98	22.5	46	23	98.1
3	Aircondition Schools	1	3.33	18.6	38	29	98.1
4	Renovate/Adapt Existing Facilities	6	3.86	5.4	23	39	98.1
5	Additional Vocational Facilities	2	3.91	16.2	27	45	98.1
6	Maintain/Improve Existing Schools	3	3.98	8.3	18	43	98.1

Should strict adherence to priorities be observed?

	Yes	No	No Response
n	79	114	15
%	38.0	54.8	7.2

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARY

Item No.	Title	Author	Year	Price	Notes
1	1911
2	1912
3	1913
4	1914
5	1915
6	1916
7	1917
8	1918
9	1919
10	1920

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARY

...

...

PROJECTS OF INTEREST DERIVED FROM RESEARCH
 IN THE AREA OF EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

1964-1965
 1965-1966

PROJECTS OF INTEREST DERIVED FROM RESEARCH
 IN THE AREA OF EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

Project	Year	From	Mean	Ranking	Ranking	Ranking	Ranking
			Score	1964-65	1965-66	1966-67	1967-68
1	1964-65	4	1.00	20.4	32	20	94.7
2	1965-66	2	1.04	20.9	46	26	94.2
3	1966-67	3	1.11	19.6	40	21	94.2
4	1967-68	6	1.46	14.1	11	20	94.4
5	1968-69	1	1.71	7.7	22	14	94.4
6	1969-70	2	1.78	6.3	11	17	94.4

PROJECTS OF INTEREST DERIVED FROM RESEARCH
 IN THE AREA OF EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

Year	From	Mean	Ranking
1964-65	4	1.00	20.4
1965-66	2	1.04	20.9
1966-67	3	1.11	19.6
1967-68	6	1.46	14.1
1968-69	1	1.71	7.7
1969-70	2	1.78	6.3

**PRIORITIES OF CAPITAL CONSTRUCTION NEEDS
SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS**

Number
REPLY-MAILING 4,094

Number who did not respond
to question in part 1,001

Rank	Item	Item #	Mean Rank	Ranking from all	Ranking from top two	Ranking from all Nation Two	Responding to Item
1	Additional Schools	1	3.04	20.5	47	26	97.0
2	Additional Teachers	4	3.24	20.3	46	33	96.9
3	Additional Vocational Education	3	3.30	12.9	33	20	96.9
4	Additional Maintenance/Improvement	2	3.47	17.5	35	33	97.0
5	Additional Maintenance/Improvement	6	3.63	7.7	26	31	96.8
6	Additional Schools	7	4.15	4.0	15	30	96.7

Should strict adherence to priorities be observed?

Yes	No	No Response
2,070	1,771	244
50.0	43.3	5.9

PRIORITIES OF CAPITAL CONSTRUCTION NEEDS
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL TEACHERS

Number Responding 4,132

Number who are parents of students in DEPB 1,044

Rank	Item	Mean Rank	Ranking Item as #1	Ranking Item in Top Two	Ranking Item in Bottom Two	Responding to Item
1	Mitigation Schools	2.66	38.7	57	21	96.5
2	Renovate/Adapt Existing Facilities	3.37	12.6	34	26	96.3
3	Replace obsolete Schools	3.38	13.2	33	27	96.2
4	Eliminate Double Sessions	3.39	23.3	39	35	96.4
5	Maintain/Improve Existing Schools	3.91	6.9	20	40	96.2
6	Additional Vocational Facilities	4.21	7.6	19	51	96.2

Should strict adherence to priorities be observed?

Yes 2,138 51.7
No 1,994 48.3

THE SURVEY INSTRUMENT

March, 1975

NEEDS ASSESSMENT SURVEY
DADE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Please check the one category that most clearly represents your affiliation.

- 1. County/Area/School Advisory Committee
- 2. Other participating community or school related group
- 3. Secondary school principal/assistant principal
- 4. Elementary principal/assistant principal/administrative assistant
- 5. Secondary school teacher
- 6. Elementary school teacher
- 7. County/area administrator

8. Yes No I am a parent of a student (or a student) enrolled in the Dade County Public Schools.

PROBLEMS

Listed below are 15 existing or possible problems facing the Dade County Schools. Indicate your feelings as to the relative seriousness of each by ranking them from 1 through 15; assign a rank of 1 to the most serious problem. Do not assign the same rank to more than one item. Please respond to all items.

- 1. General discipline in the schools
- 2. Prevention and treatment of severe or repeating misbehavior problems
- 3. Overcrowded schools
- 4. Class size
- 5. Substance abuse (e.g., misuse of drugs, alcohol)
- 6. Financing capital construction projects
- 7. Financing operating costs of education
- 8. Integration of schools
- 9. Responding to special needs of individual students
- 10. Curriculum adaptability (relevance, flexibility etc.,)
- 11. Achievement level of students in basic skills
- 12. Competency level of teachers
- 13. Racial/ethnic discrimination
- 14. Public attitudes toward the school system
- 15. Maintaining an appropriate balance in the curriculum

Please list any other important problems that should be included and state briefly how it should be solved. Do not assign a rank.

Auth.: MIS; Exp. Date: 5-21-75

PRIORITIES OF EXISTING PROGRAM AREAS

Listed below are 17 areas of emphasis in the school system's ongoing programs. Disregard the degree of emphasis now placed on each. Please indicate your feeling as to the relative importance in terms of meeting the needs of the students by ranking them from 1 through 17; assign a rank of 1 to your highest priority. Do not assign the same rank to more than one item. Please respond to all items.

1. _____ Basic curriculum (general knowledge)
2. _____ College preparatory curriculum
3. _____ Development of saleable vocational skills
4. _____ Physical/Health Education
5. _____ Basic communication and computational skills
6. _____ Aesthetics/fine arts
7. _____ Attitudes, values, mental health, etc.
8. _____ Environmental Education
9. _____ Bilingual Education
10. _____ Preparation for functioning effectively as citizens
11. _____ Exceptional Child Education
12. _____ Special programs for the disadvantaged (non-federal)
13. _____ Adult Basic and Vocational Education
14. _____ Community School program
15. _____ Home and family living/consumer education
16. _____ Career awareness/exploration, elementary/junior high schools
17. _____ Prevention/treatment of student misbehavior

EMPHASIS ON SOLUTIONS TO PROBLEMS

Listed below are several activities or programs which are considered by some to be viable means of improving the quality of education in the Dade County Schools. Indicate your feelings as to the importance of these by circling one of the following:

1. Critical - Should be given high funding priority.
2. Very important - Should be given additional funding if revenues permit.
3. Important - Should be funded at least at present level.
4. Less important - Funding could be reduced somewhat.
5. Not important - Funding should definitely be reduced or eliminated.

Do not circle more than one response per item; please respond to all items listed.

	<u>CRITICAL</u>	<u>VERY IMPORTANT</u>	<u>IMPORTANT</u>	<u>LESS IMPORTANT</u>	<u>NOT IMPORTANT</u>
1. Raise the competency level of teachers by improving the staff development program.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Provide additional curriculum/instructional support services to teachers (on-site assistance, curriculum improvement/development)	1	2	3	4	5

EMPHASIS ON SOLUTIONS TO PROBLEMS

	<u>CRITICAL</u>	<u>VERY IMPORTANT</u>	<u>IMPORTANT</u>	<u>LESS IMPORTANT</u>	<u>NOT IMPORTANT</u>
3. Place increased emphasis on prevention and control of student misbehavior.	1	2	3	4	5
4. Increase the availability of quality instructional materials, equipment and media.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Allocate additional personnel to schools so as to assure appropriate pupil-teacher ratios.	1	2	3	4	5
6. Increase emphasis on attracting, hiring, retaining "good" teachers.	1	2	3	4	5
7. Expand the Elementary Counseling program.	1	2	3	4	5
8. Expand implementation of the Quinquennial curriculum to elementary schools.	1	2	3	4	5
9. Improve mastery of the basic skills through expanding the implementation of individualized programs.	1	2	3	4	5
10. Improve basic skills competencies by expanding reading and mathematics programs at all levels.	1	2	3	4	5
11. Improve student achievement by providing more assistance for teachers.	1	2	3	4	5
12. Increase decisionmaking at the school level by providing for more discretionary use of resources.	1	2	3	4	5
13. Insure that every student is given the opportunity to develop a saleable (vocational) skill before leaving school.	1	2	3	4	5

EMPHASIS ON SOLUTIONS TO PROBLEMS

	<u>CRITICAL</u>	<u>VERY IMPORTANT</u>	<u>IMPORTANT</u>	<u>LESS IMPORTANT</u>	<u>NOT IMPORTANT</u>
14. Improve and expand placement and follow-up services for all students leaving or graduating from school.	1	2	3	4	5
15. Insure that all non-English speaking pupils master basic communication skills in English by expanding and improving the English for Speakers of Other Languages program.	1	2	3	4	5
16. Insure that all non-Spanish speaking pupils are given the voluntary opportunity to learn to speak and write in the Spanish language.	1	2	3	4	5
17. Respond to societal problems (drug abuse, alcoholism, etc.) by expanding the Comprehensive Health Education program.	1	2	3	4	5
18. Relieve overcrowding in the schools by construction of additional schools.	1	2	3	4	5
19. Improve maintenance and repairs of existing schools.	1	2	3	4	5
20. Expand security services.	1	2	3	4	5
21. Increase participation of the community through an improved or expanded community advisory committee structure.	1	2	3	4	5
22. Continue to expand the Community School program.	1	2	3	4	5
23. Expand and improve the adult basic and adult vocational program.	1	2	3	4	5

EMPHASIS ON SOLUTIONS TO PROBLEMS

	<u>CRITICAL</u>	<u>VERY IMPORTANT</u>	<u>IMPORTANT</u>	<u>LESS IMPORTANT</u>	<u>NOT IMPORTANT</u>
24. Expand and improve the program for identification, placement and instruction of special education students.	1	2	3	4	5
25. Provide for needs of the economically and culturally disadvantaged by expanding local compensatory education programs.	1	2	3	4	5
26. Maintain a balance in the curriculum by expanding art, music and other electives in the elementary school curriculum.	1	2	3	4	5
27. Maintain a balance in the curriculum by increasing emphasis on basic education such as mathematics, science, social studies, language arts.	1	2	3	4	5
28. Improve program decision-making by providing more indepth evaluations of specific programs.	1	2	3	4	5
29. Expand the career awareness/ career exploratory programs at elementary/junior high levels.	1	2	3	4	5
30. Develop a program of educational options (as to philosophies, teaching strategies, physical environment, etc.) by creating separate optional schools.	1	2	3	4	5
31. Increase competencies of management.	1	2	3	4	5
32. Increase emphasis on consumer education in the curriculum.	1	2	3	4	5

EMPHASIS ON SOLUTIONS TO PROBLEMS

	<u>CRITICAL</u>	<u>VERY IMPORTANT</u>	<u>IMPORTANT</u>	<u>LESS IMPORTANT</u>	<u>NOT IMPORTANT</u>
33. Increase opportunities for job training or retraining for adults.	1	2	3	4	5
34. Increase the dissemination of occupational and vocational education information.	1	2	3	4	5

Please list any alternatives or additions to the above listing that you think should be implemented or expanded and state briefly how the recommended activity would improve the quality of education in Dade County Public Schools; indicate whether or not it is "critical", "very important", "important", etc.

Consider the fact that the projected funds for capital construction will not be adequate over the next five years to meet the identified needs. Listed below are several needs that may compete for limited funds. Please indicate your feelings as to the priorities among them by assigning a rank to each from 1 through 6; assign a rank of 1 to your highest priority. Do not assign any item more than one rank. Please respond to all items.

1. Provide airconditioning for non-airconditioned schools.
2. Provide additional vocational education facilities.
3. Maintain or improve interior and exterior of existing school buildings.
4. Eliminate double sessions and/or the extended school day.
5. Construct new facilities to replace structurally obsolete schools.
6. Renovate existing classrooms or schools to adapt to curricular needs.

If priorities were established for the above in some satisfactory manner, do you agree that the needs should be met in strict priority order (i.e., priority need number 1 should be completely met before priority need number 2 receives funds, etc.)?

Yes No