DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 118 656 TM 005 156

AUTHOR Clark, Sara; McCormick, Thomas
TITLE The Title I, ESEA Program in Minneapolis: 1974-75. An Evaluation..
INSTITUTION Minneapolis Public Schools, Minn. Dept. of Research and Evaluation.
SPONS AGENCY Bureau of School Systems (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C. Div. of Education for the Disadvantaged.
REPORT NO C-74-40
PUB DATE Nov 75
NOTE 64p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS Behavioral Objectives; *Compensatory Education Programs; *Disadvantaged Youth; Elementary Secondary Education; Mathematics; *Needs Assessment; Parochial Schools; *Program Evaluation; Public Schools; Reading; *Student Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS *Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I; ESEA Title I; Minneapolis Public Schools; Minnesota (Minneapolis)

ABSTRACT

This report was prepared as partial fulfillment of the evaluation requirements given in the state of Minnesota's Regulations and Guidelines for Title I ESEA. Objectives for the program were given in terms of gains measured by teacher judgement and achievement tests. Results in terms of test data, will be reported at a later time. Results, based solely on needs assessment data, showed that the program failed to meet those objectives which were based on teacher ratings. The percentage of Title I eligible students who had been rated poor or serious in reading and/or math in fall 1974 and were rated one level higher in spring 1975 were from 7 percent to 31 percent below the percentage stated in the objectives. Discussion of the teacher judgment discrepancies suggest that there was no empirical basis for the expected percentages of students given in the objectives who would be rated one level higher in the spring. Descriptions of projects that were active in 1974-75 are included along with a history of the development of the oveall Title I program in Minneapolis. Recommentations will not be made until the achievement test data analysis has been completed. (RC)

Research and Evaluation

Planning and Support Services Division

Minneapolis Public Schools

Minneapolis Public Schools

THE TITLE I, ESEA PROGRAM IN MINNEAPOLIS: 1974-75

AN EVALUATION

Sara Clark, Research Specialist

Thomas McCormick, Contracted Evaluator

This report was produced with the assistance of Title I, ESEA funds

C-74-40
November 1975

Research and Evaluation Department
Planning and Support Services Division
807 N.E. Broadway
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55413

Special School District No. 1

MINNEAPOLIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS

MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA

Minneapolis Public Schools

The Title I, ESEA Program in Minneapolis: 1974-75
An Evaluation

Summary

This report was prepared as partial fulfillment of the evaluation requirements given in the State of Minnesota's Regulations and Guidelines for Title I ESEA. (See Pages: v)

Objectives for the program were given in terms of gains measured by teacher judgment and achievement tests. Results in terms of test data will be reported at a later time. (16)

Results, based solely on needs assessment data, showed that the program failed to meet those objectives which were based on teacher ratings. The percentages of Title I eligible students who had been rated poor or serious in reading and/or math in fall 1974 and were rated one level higher in spring 1975 were from 7% to 31% below the percentages stated in the objectives. (48, 49-50)

Discussion of possible reasons for the discrepancies between the objectives and results, in terms of teacher judgment, suggest that there was no empirical basis for the expected percentages of students given in the objectives who would be rated one level higher in the spring. (53-54)

About 12,000 students were eligible for Title I services. They were enrolled in 31 public elementary and eight public junior high schools and in 13 non-public schools which were Title I eligible. Students were designated as Title I participants primarily on the basis of their need for special assistance in the basic skills of reading and mathematics. The Federal Projects Needs Assessment Survey, which uses teacher judgment, and achievement test scores for students in grade 4 and higher, were used to identify these pupils within the eligible Title I schools. The reading status of 87% of the participating students was rated by teachers as poor or serious; in math 84% received such ratings. (24, 6, 19, 31)

Descriptions of projects that were active in 1974-75 are included along with a history of the development of the over-all Title I program in Minneapolis. (10-16)

Nearly 400 Title I staff positions were needed to provide the services which were offered in the 1974-75 school year. (32-36)

About three-fourths of the $3,444,418 budget for the regular school year was allocated for elementary school programs. Reading programs received a larger percentage of Title I money than did math programs. (37-45)

Recommendations will not be made until the achievement test data analysis has been completed. (54)

* * *

November 1975

Research and Evaluation Department

Table of Contents

List of Tables

FOREWORD

This document has been prepared to help fulfill Title I evaluation requirements as outlined in the ESEA statutes and the Code of Federal Regulations as presented in the State of Minnesota's Regulations and Guidelines for Title I ESEA.[1] The guidelines suggest that data be presented in tabular form, if possible, accompanied by a short narrative.

The guidelines state further that school districts that test in the fall of the year may experience a challenge in meeting the deadline set for the report and that the sections of the report concerned with achievement data in those districts may be submitted after the given deadline.

Minneapolis, Special School District No. 1, is presently committed to a fall testing program so assessment of achievement data and conclusions or recommendations based thereon will be presented as soon as feasible after the October testing. This report, however, includes the budget and the demographic information required. Data on student gains, based on teacher judgment of needs as specified in the program objectives, are also presented.

---

[1] State of Minnesota, Department of Education. Regulations and Guidelines, 1973-74, Title I E.S.E.A. (January, 1973). Reprinted as guidelines for 1974-75 by the Minneapolis Public Schools with permission of the State Department of Education.

Acknowledgments

Dr. Robert Bergeth, Research Specialist, provided portions of the information on the Parent Advisory Committee.

Sections of the report describing the history of the Title I program in Minneapolis were based on a previous report written by Mrs. Marge Hols of the Planning, Development and Federal Projects Department.

Our thanks to the Principals' Advisory Committee (George Haakenson, William Scott, Ann Danahy, Robert Lynch, Sister Robert Mary) and the PAC Evaluation Committee (Margie Enck, Mickey Patterson, Sally Thomas) who reviewed the report. Other reviewers included Dr. Larry Moon, Fred Dietrich, Jere Nyquist, Jean Hudson and Ruby Riney from the Minneapolis Federal Projects staff and Lary Johnson from the Research and Evaluation Department.

THE TITLE I, ESEA PROGRAM IN MINNEAPOLIS: 1974-75

AN EVALUATION

THE CITY OF MINNEAPOLIS

Minneapolis is a city of 424,000 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 2,026,000, 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 most major cities, possibly due to the variety and density of industry in the city as well as to the capability of its work force. The Twin City metropolitan area unemployment rate in June of 1975 was 7.6%, compared with a 9.1% national rate for the same month. As the economic center of a prosperous region, rich in such natural resources as forests, minerals, water 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 serviee 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 committees 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 nonexistent 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 had 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 American Indian, mainly Chippewa and Sioux. Only a small number of residents of Spanish-surnamed or Asian origins live in the city. In 1970 non-white residents made up 6% 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 civil unrest. Crime rates are below national averages.

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 almost 31% of the state's AFDC families.

There has been a steady migration to the city by American Indians 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 jobs and a better way of life. Some make it; many do not. The American Indian 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

In Minneapolis, 63,853 children go to school. Most of them (53,370) attend one of the city's 98 public schools; 10,483 attend non-public schools.[2]

The Minneapolis Public Schools, headed by Dr. John B. Davis, Jr. as superintendent from 1967 through June 1975, consist of about 60 elementary schools, 15 junior high schools, 11 high schools and over 15 special locations. These figures are approximate because of the problems of classifying some schools which span several grade levels such as 6-12. Nearly 3,600 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 officials are elected by popular vote 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 1974-75 was $78,563,641, up from $72,277,464 spent in 1973-74. Minneapolis received federal funds totaling 12.3 million dollars in 1974-75 from many different federal aid programs. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act provided about 7.3 million dollars, of which more than 4.2 million dollars were

[2]Figures in this section and the next one on the Title I Target Area were obtained from a number of sources within the Minneapolis Public Schools system. These sources are on file in the MPS Research and Evaluation Department.

from Title I funds. The adjusted maintenance cost per pupil unit in the system was $1,116 in 1973-74 while the range of per pupil unit costs in the state for districts maintaining elementary and secondary schools was $541 to $1,515. (Figures for 1974-75 are not yet available.)

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

In the summer of 1973, decentralization was carried one step further when the entire school district, with the exception of five schools involved in an experimental program called Southeast Alternatives, was divided into three areas. Each of these areas--East, West, and North--is headed by an Area Superintendent who has autonomous decision-making power within the guidelines of school district policies and philosophies.

Based on sight counts on October 15, 1974 (compiled by the Information Services Center of the Minneapolis Public Schools) the percentage of black American pupils for the school district was 12.5%. Ten years before, the percentage was 5.4%. American Indian children comprised 4.8% of the school population in 1974, more than double the proportion of ten years ago. Although some non-white pupils were enrolled in every elementary school, non-white pupils were concentrated in two relatively small areas of the city. Of the 60 elementary schools, 17 had more than 30% non-white enrollment and none of these had more than 50%. There were no all-black nor all-white schools. Eleven elementary schools had non-white enrollments of less than 5%.

The Minneapolis School Board-approved desegregation plan involving two-way busing took effect in secondary schools in September 1973 and in elementary schools in September 1974. This plan was designed to achieve racially "balanced" schools.

The proportion of school age children in AFDC homes has doubled from about 12% in 1962 to 24% in 1974.

While the median pupil turnover rate for all the city schools in 1973-74 (latest figures available) was about 26%, this figure varied widely with location. (Turnover rate is the percentage of students that comes new or leaves the school at some time during the school year, using the September enrollment as a base figure.)

THE TITLE I TARGET AREA AND ITS SCHOOLS

The Target Area is that part of the city of Minneapolis in which schools are eligible for programs funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).

In 1974-75 Title I eligibility for a school was determined by a formula in which the number of AFDC students in the school's attendance district was doubled and added to the number of students in that district from families with annual incomes under $3,000 and the number of public school students participating in the free lunch program. The sum of these three factors was divided by the total enrollment in the public and non-public schools in the school's attendance district. If the resulting figure exceeded the citywide average, the school was eligible for Title I aid.

According to 1970 census data, more than 170,000 persons resided in the Target Area. Of that group, 11% were black and 3.5% were Indian, more than double the citywide percentage of minority group members. More than half of the Target Area residents over 25 years of age had not completed high school, compared to 35% 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 non-Target Area residents had gone to college, and 15% had completed four or more years of college.

The income for an average Target Area family was $9,113 in 1970, about $2,000 less than the citywide average. The homes in which they lived had an average value of $10,385, about 40% less than the average

value of a single family residence in Minneapolis. Twenty percent of Target Area children between the ages of 6 and 17 were members of a family that had an income below the poverty level, while only six percent of the non-Target Area children were members of such families.

In 1974-75, in the 31 elementary schools, eight junior highs, and 13 non-public schools that received Title I aid there were over 21,000 students. One-third of these students were from minority ethnic groups. Title I Target Area schools generally experience a much higher turnover rate than do non-Title I schools; in fact only four of the Target Area schools had turnover rates less than the city median in 1973-74. Attendance rates also differed for the Title I and the non-Title I schools. Table 1 shows these differences.

Table 1

Attendance Scattergram for 1974-75 Title I and Non-Title I Elementary Schools

Type of School	1974-75 Per Cent of Attendance									
	87	88	89	90	91	92	93	94	95	95
Title I Schools	x	x			xxxxx xx	xxxxx	xxxxx	xxxxx xxxxx xx		
Non-Title I Schools				x			xxx	xx	xxxxx xxxxx xxxxx x	xxxxx xxxxx

x= one school

Table 2 lists the Target elementary, secondary and non-public schools for each year since 1965-66, when Title I funds became available. The table shows that 12 of the 31 public elementary Target schools in 1974-75 have been designated as Target schools every year

Table 2
Minneapolis Title I Schools
1965-1975

Elementary	65-66	66-67	67-68	68-69	69-70	70-71	71-72	72-73	73-74	74-75
Adams	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	Closed		
Anwatin										X
Bancroft						X	X	X	X	X
Blaine	X	X	X	Closed						
Bremer	X	X					X	X	X	X
Bryn Mawr										X
Calhoun								X	X	X
Cleveland										X
Clinton	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Corcoran	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Douglas								X	X	Closed
Emerson	X	X								
Grant/Bethune	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Greeley	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Hall	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Harrison	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Hawthorne	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Hay	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	Closed
Holland								X	X	X
Irving	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Kenwood										X
Lincoln Intermediate										X
Longfellow										X
Loring										X
Lowell	X	X				X	X	X	X	X
Lyndale		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Madison	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Mann	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	Closed
Marcy	X	X								
McKinley										X
Monroe	X	Closed								
Motley	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			Closed
Northrop										X
Penn										X
Pratt	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			
Pierce	X	Closed								
Prescott							X	X	X	Closed
Putnam								X	X	X
Seward	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Sheridan	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	Closed
Standish										X
Warrington	X	Closed								
Webster	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Whittier			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Willard	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Elementary Total	26	24	21	20	20	21	24	25	25	31

Table 2 (continued)

Secondary	65-66	66-67	67-68	68-69	69-70	70-71	71-72	72-73	73-74	74-75
Junior High										
Bryant	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Bryant Y.E.S. Center				X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Franklin	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Jefferson									X	X
Jordan							X		X	X
Lincoln	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	Closed
North Area Learning Center	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Olson									X	
Phillips	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Sheridan	X	X	X	X	X		X	X		X
Senior High										
Central	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		
North	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
South	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	(Ninth grade only)	
Secondary Total	9	9	9	10	10	9	11	10	10	8
Non-public Schools										
Ascension	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Basilica	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Holy Cross	X						X	X	X	X
Holy Rosary	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Immanuel Lutheran									X	X
Incarnation									X	X
St. Albert										X
St. Anne						X	X	X	X	X
St. Austin										X
St. Bridget										X
St. Boniface	X		X	X	X		Closed			
St. Cyril	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	X
St. Joseph	X	X	X	X	Closed					
St. Phillips	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	Closed		
St. Stephen	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
South Park Consolidated (a consolidation of St. Helena and Holy Name)							X	X	X	X
Non-public Total	9	6	8	8	7	6	9	8	10	13
Grand Total	44	39	38	38	37	36	44	43	45	52

since 1965-66. Four junior high schools and four non-public schools have been designated as Target schools consistently since 1965. The three senior highs which received Title I services from 1965 to 1972 are no longer served due to limited funds and state guidelines which require that elementary children be served before older students.

The modifications in the list of Title I schools for 1974-75 were due to several factors. Douglas, Hay, Mann, and Prescott, which were built between 1884 and 1905, were torn down. The Motley building was used to house the South East Alternatives Free School which was not Title I. Sheridan, which had included both elementary and junior high schools, was used for grades 7-9. Lincoln, which had been a Title I school since the beginning of the program, was closed as a junior high and reopened as Lincoln Intermediate Center, part of an elementary cluster. Lincoln Learning Center was renamed North Area Learning Center. Emerson had been used for several years as a special education facility for trainable mentally retarded children. The schools which were added to the 1974-75 list became Title I eligible primarily because of the boundary changes and pairing or clustering of schools required for implementation of the Minneapolis desegregation/integration plans. About one-third of all Minneapolis schools were designated as Title I eligible in 1974-75.

This section has described the City of Minneapolis, its schools, and its Title I Target schools. The next section contains a brief historical review of Title I programs in Minneapolis, how they developed and what they did in 1974-75.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE TITLE I PROGRAM IN MINNEAPOLIS

How did the Minneapolis Title I program develop? What services have been provided to children? Has the program changed since its beginning in 1965? This section describes the background of the Title I program in Minneapolis and tells how it has changed over the years.

In 1965, in communities across the nation, Title I meant:

- Remedial reading centers
- Family counseling
- Art Action Centers for first graders
- Clothing for low-income children to wear in physical education classes
- Free breakfasts for poor children
- Work-study programs for teenagers

It meant services for children who were "economically, educationally, and culturally disadvantaged," in practical terms, for all children living in Title I eligible areas.

In 1974-75, Title I meant:

- Intensive instruction in reading and mathematics for children who lived in low income areas and were at least one year below grade level in those subjects
- Emphasis on reaching children of elementary age
- Detailed evaluation of children's progress in reading and math

Why the change?

When the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) was passed in 1965, it was called a "new front" in the "War on Poverty." Educators and legislators assumed that ESEA would offer services to poor children and that the poverty program would provide for low-income adults. Health care, social services, and cultural opportunities were included in the program. The assumption was that if poor children had more of the kinds of experiences and services that middle class children typically received, they would do better in school. A brochure about Title I published in 1966 by the U. S. Office of Education stated:

> Educators who serve children in low income areas of the country now realize that a major reason their youngsters do not succeed in school is a lack of proper food and clothing. They have learned...,.of the necessity for special enrichment, cultural and recreational activities to help fill the vacuum in their students' lives. Their new programs also are being geared to overcome the social and emotional inadequacies that are partially responsible for the failure of these youngsters.

The expectations of those early years were not realized. The wide range of services and programs may have benefited many children, but evidence of measurable gains in school achievement was lacking. Apparently, Title I was trying to do too many things for too many children with too little money. In Minneapolis, for example, the number of low income children in the city rose from 9,000 in 1966 to 14,000 in 1970, but the amount of Title I money stayed about the same.

By 1969, Congress and educators were concerned about Title I:

- There was no proof, from the collection of test data, that Title I programs worked
- In some cases, the schools were providing services--with Title I funds--that were the responsibility of other agencies

The result was a new emphasis on Title I programs that would make a measurable difference in children's learning of basic skills; in short, an emphasis on reading and mathematics. It meant concentrating the money on children in lower grades who were just learning those skills. It meant concentrating on children who were already behind or who were most likely to fall behind. It meant limiting the programs to projects having a direct effect on teaching reading and math--through extra teachers, better teaching materials, more training for teachers. Fortunately, the federal funding requirements coincided with what Minneapolis teachers wanted from Title I--more help in teaching reading to young children. The Title I Reading Program began in the Minneapolis Public Schools in 1968, in part, because teachers requested it.

Among other changes in programming over the years:

- Title I programs not related to teaching reading or math were gradually phased out or shifted to local funding
- Programs in line with new national and local priorities were developed. The most recent addition was a math program for elementary children started in 1972
- Title I programs for high school students were phased out
- New programs concentrated services on elementary school children or on junior high students lacking the basic skills of reading and mathematics
- The Title I teacher aide project, as such, closed at the end of the 1971-72 school year. Since then, the aides have been used as regular school employees

What Kinds of Programs are Supported by Title I Funds?

Most of the Title I funds have been used in programs which teach children to read. A major effort has been made by the Title I reading program to teach children to read.

The Title I Reading Program. When the Title I Reading Program began in 1968, 20 different reading textbooks were in use in Minneapolis schools. Teachers worried that children who moved from school to school, as many inner city children do, would get confused and lose ground. The first step, then, was to standardize the basal reading curriculum and teaching methods in all Title I schools. Two more steps became possible after the standardization was completed. First, a team of reading experts and teachers created instructional materials to supplement the adopted books. Second, teachers attended workshops and classes to learn how to use the new materials.

Why new materials? They gave children more practice than the textbooks, and they let children learn in different ways. Children listened to tapes, built words with letter cards and letter blocks, and played a variety of word games. The idea was to get children actively involved in a lesson and to give teachers more choices in reading skills instruction.

Separate materials were originally produced for children in the primary grades. Later, materials were developed for the intermediate grades.

Since the decentralization of the Minneapolis Public Schools in the fall of 1973, each of the three areas has had its own Title I reading team. There have been three separate primary teams for two years and a K-9 team for one year.

Some materials, such as those for kindergarten, built pre-reading skills. There were tests, too, to help teachers decide what lessons a child needed and to measure the child's progress. Finally, to help classroom teachers "put it all together," experienced reading teachers visited classrooms. They showed teachers how to use the materials, how to decide which materials were best for each child, and how to use progress tests.

The Instructional Materials Center (IMC) provided support to Title I projects. Using modern high speed graphic arts equipment, it printed, manufactured, stored and distributed supplementary materials developed by the Title I Reading, Math, and Cassette staff members. It produced

"little books" written by teachers, as well as games, worksheets, and tests which were all colorful and original. Rapid production for low cost has been the IMC's specialty. If, for example, the writing team prepared a game, it was printed, packaged and ready for delivery in one day. The IMC has also provided space for in-service training and housed various Title I resource teams.

A lot has been going on to help kids learn to read. But while they've been learning, what happened to 5th graders who were asked to read from a 5th grade science or math book but whose reading achievement was at the 2nd or 3rd grade level? To help these students, the Title I Cassette Program was started in 1969 at Clinton Elementary School. The idea was to record lessons on cassette tapes so the children could learn by listening.

It worked so well that soon teachers at the other Title I schools wanted cassette lessons. The Cassette Program was then moved to the IMC where the staff had experience in mass production and distribution of teaching materials. In 1972-73, the Cassette Program supplied each Title I elementary school with 300 cassette tape lessons, all catalogued and ready for teachers to check out, just like library books. Each school was assigned a specially trained teacher aide to maintain its library. Additional tapes have been distributed since 1972-73.

The Cassette Program has provided tapes on language arts, literature for listening, math, science, and social studies. Tapes have been made to go with the basic reading books, too.

Children liked the taped lessons because they could use them by themselves. Teachers liked the flexibility the tapes provided. One group of children could use the cassettes while the teacher worked with another group.

In spite of these concentrated efforts to help children in regular classrooms, there were some who still were non-readers or who read at the first grade level. These children did not seem to profit from the regular classroom reading program. That's where the Basic Skill Centers came in.

The Basic Skill Centers (BSC). In 1968, the Minneapolis Schools opened two Basic Skill Centers to help "older" children in Title I schools learn to read. The Centers operated mainly with local funds; however, teacher aides, an important part of the staff, were paid with Title I funds.

The Centers served 536 children in grades 3 through 8 in 1974-75. These children spent about 40 minutes each school day at a Center--part of the time in a classroom, the rest with a variety of teaching machines.

The first grade books, originally used in the program, were found to be too childish even for 4th graders, let alone for junior high students, so the Centers' staffs had to start from scratch. The new curriculum developed by the BSC staff has been copyrighted as the "Basic Skill Centers Reading Program." It includes film strips and cassette tapes, written by BSC staff members, which are used in machines that look like small TV sets. Programs for other machines and lessons and games for the BSC classroom were coordinated with the BSC Reading Program.

Where did the teacher aides come in? They tutored children in the Centers' classrooms. They also helped children with all the machines, answered questions, encouraged and provided an essential human element.

In 1974-75 Basic Skill Extension Centers were established in three Title I elementary schools. The learning materials and methods used were those developed at the BSC. Teachers and aides in the Extension Centers received extensive in-service from the BSC certificated staff.

The Title I Reading Programs in the Junior Highs. There was no single remedial program for Title I junior highs.

Some schools sent students to the Basic Skill Centers for help. Most schools operated remedial reading and English classes in their buildings. Phillips Junior High, for example, used the reading materials created by the Job Corps for men and women with poor reading skills. Specialists at Phillips adapted the materials for their students and provided several thousand additional reading selections.

Two mobile vans were purchased in 1970 to house reading classes. They could be moved to service different schools. The vans contained Dorsett teaching machines, the TV-like machines used in the Basic Skill Centers. In general, the lessons were different from those used at the BSC. They took up where the others left off, at about the 4th grade level, and were aimed at helping students to learn new words and to understand more of what they read. The Basic Skill Centers program was used, however, for the lower level readers. A teacher and an aide worked in each van to assess the students' progress and give assistance when necessary.

The Title I Math Program. The Title I Math Program has been a relatively new effort. It began in 1972 with the same approach as that used for reading--getting all Title I schools to use the same series of books. Next, a Title I Elementary Math Team of teachers developed supplementary games and cards that teachers in kindergarten through grade 3 could use to help Title I students learn mathematics. The "discovery approach," which guided the child to the discovery of how math works, was used rather than rote learning methods.

The Math Team has helped primary teachers use the discovery method in three ways: team members have taught in-service training courses--more than 300 teachers have been trained so far; team members have visited classrooms and demonstrated new teaching methods; the Team has made colorful new teaching materials that were mass produced at the Instructional Materials Center for much less than commercial cost.

In 1974-75 the Math Program developed a systems approach to identifying the math problems of Title I students. First, a math skills profile, listing the math skills children should know by approximate grade levels was developed. Tests were then devised to find out which skills the children knew. At five pilot sites teachers were assisted in this process by a computer. The test data were fed into the computer, and print out sheets listing skills levels of individuals and of the total class were returned.

Title I programs have also reached out to older students in need of help with basic math.

The Mathematics Basic Skills Development Project. The Math Basic Skills Development Project (MBSDP) served all Title I junior highs. Students were tested in math at the end of sixth grade in the city-wide testing program. Those who were behind in math were assigned to special classes in the fall in junior high. There they took specialized tests to find exact areas in which they needed help.

Teams of experienced inner-city teachers have prepared curriculum units for a number of topics. Workbooks on fractions, decimals, percents and five kinds of measurement have been written. Metric measurement skills were introduced in some units. These units have been copyrighted and are now available, at a cost, nationwide. Eight new units with accompanying tests were developed and field tested in 1974-75.

Since many of the students with poor math skills were also poor readers, the MBSDP units were designed to require little reading. The workbooks are relatively short. It was thought that the student would feel a sense of accomplishment when a booklet, averaging 39 pages, could be finished in a few days. The MBSDP teachers felt that many students became discouraged when faced with math texts of up to several hundred pages.

Seven different math kits, designed to introduce students to topics such as probability and symmetry, were developed in 1974-75. They made use of booklets, manipulatives and self-scored tests. The kits, which were not completely consumable, were circulated among the Title I junior highs on individual teacher requests. Nearly 700 students worked with the probability kit. Overall, the kits were used for over 2700 units of instruction.

Non-Public Schools. How did non-public schools fit into the Title I program? Educationally disadvantaged children who lived within the attendance area of the Title I public schools received Title I services even if they attended non-public schools.

In 1974-75, about 1,250 children in grades 1 through 8 at 13 Minneapolis non-public schools received special education services and extra help in reading and math, thanks to more than $170,000 in Title I funds.

The Title I funds were used to hire additional teacher aides, tutors and supplementary reading and math teachers. They worked with Title I children in small groups to reinforce classroom learning using materials purchased with Title I funds.

All non-public Title I schools were involved in the Non-Public Schools Special Education Program. In this program special education staff members assisted the schools in identifying Title I children qualified to receive Special Education services and helped teachers design effective instructional programs for these children.

OBJECTIVES

Objectives for the 1974-75 Title I project were developed for four areas of performance: Reading, Mathematics, Work Study Habits, and Behavior and Adjustment. The objectives, as included in the ESEA Title I

Proposal, FY 1975, submitted June 1974 by the Minneapolis Public Schools were specific for different grade levels. The estimated number of Title I children rated poor or serious by their teachers in the different areas were given for each objective as well as the proposed percentage of students who would show varied levels of improvement. Comparisons of the specific objectives with the actual attainment of the students in 1974-75 are given in the section of this report entitled Results. Data for Objective B in Reading and Math will be presented in an addendum to this report which will be completed when fall achievement test data are available.

The general objectives, as printed in the Title I application for grant, were as follows:

PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES

READING

The following objectives apply only for those students who have fall, 1974 Title I Needs Assessment ratings of 35 or above.

A. As measured pre-post with the Title I Needs Assessment Rating Scale for pupil status in reading, of the (Estimated N) children rated poor or serious by their regular classroom teacher in fall, 1974 (Objective) % will be rated at least one level higher in the spring on the Title I Needs Assessment Rating Scale.

B. Of the children rated poor or serious in reading in the fall included under objective A above, as measured pre-post using the city-wide testing program plus additional testing as needed.

1. (Objective) % will gain at least 3 months for each month of participation in the Title I project.

2. (Objective) % will gain between 2 and 2.9 months for each month of participation in the Title I project.

3. (Objective) % will gain between 1 and 1.9 months for each month of participation in the Title I project.

PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES

MATH

The following objectives apply only for those students who have fall, 1974 Title I Needs Assessment ratings of 35 or above.

A. As measured pre-post with the Title I Needs Assessment Rating Scale for pupil status in math, of the estimated (Estimated N) children rated poor or serious by their regular classroom teacher in fall, 1974 (Objective) % will be rated at least one level higher in the spring on the Title I Needs Assessment Rating Scale.

B. Of the children rated poor or serious in math in the fall included under objective A above, as measured pre-post using the city-wide testing program plus additional testing as needed.

1. (Objective) % will gain at least 3 months for each month of participation in the Title I project.

2. (Objective) % will gain between 2 and 2.9 months for each months of participation in the Title I project.

3. (Objective) % will gain between 1 and 1.9 months for each month of participation in the Title I project.

The Math Objectives, part B, were later revised as follows for grades 4-6:

B. Of the children rated poor or serious in math in the fall included under objective A above, and who were below grade level when tested with Minneapolis Mathematics Criterion Referenced Assessment materials in the fall, at least 50% will show mastery (80% correct) of their respective instructional level materials in the spring.

Objective B was revised for grades 7-9 to read:

B. Of the children rated poor or serious in the fall included under objective A above, at least 50% will have the same or higher percentile rankings in the spring as they did in the fall on city-wide distributions of scores on the Minneapolis Arithmetic Computation Test (MACT).

PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES

WORK STUDY HABITS

AND

BEHAVIOR AND ADJUSTMENT

These objectives apply for grade levels _____ and only for those students listed on page 9 (of the Title I proposal) of the unduplicated count number.

A. Of the children listed as the unduplicated count, an estimated (Estimated N) were rated poor or serious in work habits in the fall, 1974 on the Needs Assessment, (Objective) % of these will be rated at least one level higher by their classroom teacher in the spring as measured by the Title I Needs Assessment Rating Scale.

B. Of the children listed as the unduplicated count, an estimated (Estimated N) were rated poor or serious in behavior and adjustment in the fall, 1974 on the Needs Assessment, (Objective) % of these will be rated at least one level higher by their classroom teacher in the spring as measured by the Title I Needs Assessment Rating Scale.

NEEDS ASSESSMENT SURVEY

Selection of children from the Title I schools for receipt of Title I program benefits was based on their composite scores on the Needs Assessment Survey. This instrument, developed by the State of Minnesota Department of Education, made use of teacher ratings of student status in reading, math, work study habits, and behavior and adjustment. In each category weighted ratings were given of: Excellent, Average, Poor, or Serious. Weights for achievement test scores in reading and math were included in the composite score for those children in grades 4-9.

A maximum score of 100 could be given if a child's status were rated serious in all areas. Test scores could account for up to 30 points while teacher judgment of reading and math status could account for up to 60 points. Teacher judgment of work study habits, and behavior and adjustment could be assigned a maximum of 10 points. The highest scores were given to those children with the most need of assistance.

The needs of all children in Title I schools were assessed October 1974. Students who received composite scores of 35 or higher were eligible for Title I benefits. The worksheet used for data collection in grades 4-6 is shown on page 21. Information collected by means of this form, which was tabulated manually, was sufficient for identifying Title I eligible children but did not lend itself to the data reduction and analysis required for evaluation of the city's Title I program. An optically mark read survey form was developed by the Information Services Center and Data Processing departments of the Minneapolis Public Schools. The new form, which was used in May 1975, is reproduced on page 22. The instructions for completing the form are on pages 23-24. In order to have the fall needs assessment data available for data processing, teachers had to transfer the fall ratings and scores to the new form. Inevitably some information was lost in the transfer due, in part, to the mobility of the Title I students.

STUDENT PARTICIPANTS

Over 12,000 Minneapolis students were eligible for Title I services. Distributions of the fall needs assessment composite scores are given, by grade, for public elementary, secondary, and non-public schools in Tables 3-5. Students in grades K-3 who had composite scores of 35 or higher were identified as having first priority.

The unduplicated count of Title I participants, by grade and by school, is given in Tables 6-8. These numbers are smaller than those in the fall distributions due to the loss of information that occurred in the springtime shift to computerized data collection. Data had to be transferred from the fall survey to the spring survey sheets which could be optically read and analyzed by a computer. Whether fall data sheets were lost, did not move with students who transferred, or instructions for the transfer of the fall data were unclear is not known. The total number of children in the target area schools is about the same in the two sets of tables but the identification of about a sixth of the Title I children was lost for the spring distributions. The percentages of Title I students given in Tables 6-8 are, therefore, underestimates.

Minnesota Department of Education

7 4 N A W 1
75 76 77 78 79 80

MINNEAPOLIS PUBLIC SCHOOL
Office of Planning Development & Federal Programs

F24-43 (2-74)
Mpls. Revision (9-74)
Appendix E

NEEDS ASSESSMENT WORKSHEET (Intermediate Grades 4, 5, 6)

School Name_____ School No._____ (1-3) Teacher_____ Employee No._____ (4-8)

30

1	2			3				4		5	6	7	8	9
Grade	Name of Child and Student Number			Achievement Test Scores				Teacher Judgement About Pupil Status		Work Habits	Behavior & Adjustment	Nutrition Health Status	Composite Score	Monitoring Use
Grade as of Sept.1 current school year	Student No.	Name Last	First	At or above grade level (0) Less than 1 full year below grade level (0) Bet. 1&2 yrs. below grade level (7) More than 2 yrs. below grade level (15) Reading Comprehension a) Raw Score	b) Value	Math c) Raw Score	d) Value	Reading	Math	Excel. (0) Avg. (0) Poor (3) Ser. (5)	Excel. (0) Avg. (0) Poor (3) Ser. (5)	Enter a check mark if there is a ser. problem	Sum of all Weighted values	Do Not Mark
(3-10)	(11-16)	(17-36)		(37-38)	(39-40)	(41-42)	(43-44)	(45-46)	(47-48)	(49-50)	(51-52)	(53)	(54-56)	
21														

MINNEAPOLIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS
INFORMATION SERVICES CENTER

FEDERAL PROJECTS NEEDS ASSESSMENT SURVEY

SCHOOL YEAR:

SCHOOL	STUDENT NO	STUDENT NAME	SEX	GRADE	SCHOOL NAME

(A) MAKE NO MARKS IN THIS AREA

(B) TEST DATA — TEST NAME — RAW SCORE

(C) INSTRUCTIONS
1. USE NO. 2 PENCIL ONLY
2. ERASE MISTAKES COMPLETELY
3. DO NOT FOLD OR STAPLE
4. MAKE NO STRAY MARKS
5. COMPLETELY FILL POSITION YOU MARK
6. CONSULT SCHOOL OFFICE FOR QUESTION

(D) HUNDREDS | TENS | UNITS

FALL NEEDS ASSESSMENT

PUPIL'S LEVEL: ○ KINDERGARTEN ○ PRIMARY ○ INTERMEDIATE ○ JUNIOR HIGH

PLEASE RATE THIS PUPIL ON THE APPROPRIATE ITEMS BELOW (SEE INSTRUCTION SHEET)

(E)

	EXC	AVG	POOR	SER		EXC	AVG	POOR	SER
INTELLECTUAL DEVELOPMENT	○	○	○	○	WORK HABITS	○	○	○	○
EMOTIONAL DEVELOPMENT	○	○	○	○	BEHAVIOR AND ADJUSTMENT	○	○	○	○
TEACHER JUDGMENT READING STATUS	○	○	○		ACHIEVEMENT TEST: READING	○	○	○	○
TEACHER JUDGMENT MATH STATUS	○	○	○	○	ACHIEVEMENT TEST: MATH	○	○	○	○

ENTER THE FALL NEEDS ASSESSMENT COMPOSITE SCORE HERE → AND CODE IT HERE → HUNDREDS | TENS | UNITS

SPRING NEEDS ASSESSMENT

PLEASE RATE THIS PUPIL ON THE APPROPRIATE ITEMS BELOW (SEE INSTRUCTION SHEET)

(F)

	EXC	AVG	POOR	SER		EXC	AVG	POOR	SER
INTELLECTUAL DEVELOPMENT	○	○	○	○	WORK HABITS	○	○	○	○
EMOTIONAL DEVELOPMENT	○	○	○	○	BEHAVIOR AND ADJUSTMENT	○	○	○	○
TEACHER JUDGMENT READING STATUS	○	○	○	○	TEACHER JUDGMENT: MATH STATUS	○	○	○	○

ESEA TITLE I SERVICES

INDICATE BELOW THE ESEA TITLE I SERVICES THIS PUPIL RECEIVED DURING THE CURRENT SCHOOL YEAR

(G)

	YES	NO		YES	NO
ESEA TITLE I READING ASSISTANCE	○	○	ESEA TITLE I MATHEMATICS ASSISTANCE	○	○

OTHER DATA

SEE INSTRUCTION SHEET FOR COMPLETION OF THIS SECTION

	YES NO A	B	C	D	E
RESPONSE ITEM #1	○	○	○	○	○
RESPONSE ITEM #2	○	○	○	○	○
RESPONSE ITEM #3	○	○	○	○	○
RESPONSE ITEM #4	○	○	○	○	○
RESPONSE ITEM #5	○	○	○	○	○
RESPONSE ITEM #6	○	○	○	○	○
RESPONSE ITEM #7	○	○	○	○	○
RESPONSE ITEM #8	○	○	○	○	○
RESPONSE ITEM #9	○	○	○	○	○
RESPONSE ITEM #10	○	○	○	○	○
RESPONSE ITEM #11	○	○	○	○	○
RESPONSE ITEM #12	○	○	○	○	○
RESPONSE ITEM #13	○	○	○	○	○
RESPONSE ITEM #14	○	○	○	○	○
RESPONSE ITEM #15	○	○	○	○	○
RESPONSE ITEM #16	○	○	○	○	○
RESPONSE ITEM #17	○	○	○	○	○
RESPONSE ITEM #18	○	○	○	○	○
RESPONSE ITEM #19	○	○	○	○	○
RESPONSE ITEM #20	○	○	○	○	○
RESPONSE ITEM #21	○	○	○	○	○

MINNEAPOLIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Information Services Center

FEDERAL PROJECTS NEEDS ASSESSMENT SURVEY,
INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETION

Attached are computer printed Needs Assessment Survey Forms. Please follow these instructions in completing these forms.

If a student is no longer in your class, but is in another class in your building, please forward the student's form to the other teacher.

If a student was never in your class or building, please X out the form and place it on top of your completed forms.

If you have a student for whom you do not have fall needs assessment data, please leave the fall needs assessment (section E) blank and complete the spring needs assessment (section F) and the other sections as applicable.

Please return the completed forms to the school office. Thank you for your cooperation.

In the left margin of the scan form is a circled letter indicating the section of the form. These instructions are keyed to that letter.

Pre-printed data: Across the top of the form is computer pre-printed data: School Number, Student Number, Student Name, Sex, Grade, School Name and, immediately above the school name, the date this form was printed. Do not alter any of this data. If yours is an ungraded class, the grade level recorded is that used for the city-wide testing program. (Special Education Elementary students appear as "grade 10" and Special Education Junior High students appear as "grade 11").

Section A: Make no marks in this area. This is a computer generated control number field.

Section B: Test Data: The test data printed here is from the Fall 1974 city-wide testing program. (Do not write in if test scores do not appear.)

Section C: General Instructions.
1. Use Number 2 pencil only.
2. Erase mistakes completely.
3. Do not fold or staple this form.
4. Make no stray marks.
5. Completely fill in the position you are marking.
6. Consult school office if you have questions.

Section D: Make no marks in this area.

Section E: Fall Needs Assessment.
Pupil's Level: Indicate the student's level by darkening the bubble to the left of the word Kindergarten, Primary, Intermediate or Junior High as appropriate.

Ratings: Please record the rating given this pupil last fall by darkening the appropriate bubbles. Intellectual Development (grade K only), Emotional Development (grade K only), Teacher Judgment: Reading Status (grades 1-9), Teacher Judgment: Math Status (grades 1-9), Work Habits (grades K-9), Behavior and Adjustment (grades K-9), Achievement Test: Reading (grades 4-9), Achievement Test: Math (grades 4-9).

Needs Assessment Composite Score: Please record the needs assessment composite score that this pupil received last fall on the blank provided and code the score in the area provided; mark each digit, hundreds, tens and units.

Section F: Spring Needs Assessment:
Please rate the pupil on each of the six items.
1. Intellectual Development (grade K only).
2. Emotional Development (grade K only).
3. Teacher Judgment: Reading Status (grades 1-9).
4. Work Habits (grades K-9).
5. Behavior and Adjustment (grades K-9).
6. Teacher Judgment: Math Status (grades 1-9).

Intellectual Development: Record the rating that best describes the child. Consider such things as how well does the child listen to stories, can he retell a

FEDERAL PROJECTS NEEDS ASSESSMENT SURVEY - INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETION (Cont.)

story, does he participate in show-and-tell, and progress in pre-reading activities.

Emotional Development: Record the rating that best describes the child. Consider such things as cooperation, display of leadership, thoughtfulness and respect for authority.

Work Habits: Record the rating that best describes the child. Consider such things as procrastination, punctuality, participation in class activities, use of study time, accuracy and neatness.

Behavior and Adjustment: Record the rating that best describes the child. Include such items as dependability, initiative, courtesy and distractability.

Teacher Judgment: Reading Status: Math Status: Record the reading and math ratings that best describe the child. Teacher judgments about pupil status should be tied to the curriculum and should correspond to those judgments reported on the cumulative record and that part of the report card that reports grade level achievement. (Evaluate pupil status, not progress.) The reading Book Level References for Teachers and the Math: Teacher Judgment Guide Sheet, are intended to be used as a guide in helping teachers make these judgments.

Section G: ESEA I Services: Indicate (YES or NO) whether or not this pupil participated in reading or math or both through a Title I program. If both services, mark both reading and math.

OTHER DATA: Grades K-6:
In response to Items #1-11, indicate your answer to the following questions by darkening the bubble under either YES or NO. Consider Title I service to mean on a regular basis (three or more times a week) and for more than half of the year.

1. Has this child received the services of a Title I supplementary teacher in reading?
2. Has this child received the services of a Title I aide in reading?
3. Has this child received the services of a Title I tutor in reading?
4. Has this child received the services of a Title I supplementary teacher in math?
5. Has this child received the services of a Title I aide in math?
6. Has this child received the services of a Title I tutor in math?
7. Has this child attended a Basic Skills Center or a Basic Skills Extension Center?
8. Has this child participated in The Emergency School Assistance Act Reading Program?
9. Has this child received the services of a S.L.B.P. teacher or tutor?
10. Has this child received the services of an M.R. teacher or tutor?
11. Do you think this child needs Title I service next year?

Grades 7-9:
In response to Item #12, indicate your answer to the following statement by darkening the bubble under A, B, or C (Ross Taylor will distribute the appropriate percentile distributions).

12. The spring percentile ranking for this student on the M.A.C.T. is:

    A. The same or higher than it was last fall.
    B. Lower than it was last fall.
    C. Test data not available.

Thank you again for your cooperation.

FTR:ve
5/1/75

Table 3

Needs Assessment Frequency Distribution
Summary of Elementary Public Target Schools
Fall 1974

Needs Assessment Score	Grade							Line Totals
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	
96-100	141	160	210	138	60	175	160	1044
91-95	4	0	1	0	85	98	65	253
86-90	35	84	108	86	77	71	63	524
81-85	87	71	76	62	161	159	122	738
76-80	22	65	74	56	74	54	54	399
71-75	63	93	105	120	106	80	77	644
66-70	59	90	80	114	131	101	108	683
61-65	69	53	124	74	44	71	56	491
56-60	95	98	116	78	90	99	99	675
51-55	46	82	145	137	113	153	122	798
46-50	261	124	43	58	50	40	50	626
41-45	103	116	68	66	117	112	169	751
35-40	336	285	280	204	88	84	84	1361
Sub-total 1 [a]	1321	1321	1430	1193	1196	1297	1229	8987
31-34	0	0	0	0	24	25	33	82
26-30	72	35	34	30	66	94	150	481
21-25	70	40	35	31	89	103	109	477
16-20	78	139	157	108	20	16	37	555
11-15	8	9	13	17	101	239	341	728
6-10	44	27	29	46	147	162	82	537
0-5	625	472	349	423	244	88	40	2241
Sub-total 2	897	722	617	655	691	727	792	5101
Total Enrollment	2218	2043	2047	1848	1887	2024	2021	14088

[a] Sub-total 1 gives the number of pupils, by grade level, who were eligible for Title I services.

Table 4

Needs Assessment Frequency Distribution
Summary of Secondary Public Target Schools
Fall 1974

Needs Assessment Score	Grade			Line Totals
	7	8	9	
96-100	126	75	33	234
91-95	28	19	10	57
86-90	34	18	4	56
81-85	92	94	33	219
76-80	41	38	12	91
71-75	60	31	16	107
66-70	121	98	43	262
61-65	29	56	19	104
56-60	77	62	32	171
51-55	99	97	37	233
46-50	61	51	20	132
41-45	73	95	24	192
35-40	82	120	34	236
Sub-total 1[a]	923	854	317	2094
31-34	26	31	17	74
26-30	81	73	26	180
21-25	107	96	37	240
16-20	17	34	9	60
11-15	108	92	24	224
6-10	90	145	46	281
0-5	545	507	280	1332
Sub-total 2	974	978	439	2391
Total Enrollment	1897	1832	756	4485

[a]Sub-total 1 gives the number of pupils, by grade level, who were eligible for Title I services.

Table 5

Needs Assessment Frequency Distribution
Summary of Non-Public Target Schools
Fall 1974

Needs Assessment Score	Grade									Line Totals
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
96-100	2	27	13	22	4	23	25	24	11	151
91-95	0	0	0	0	7	5	9	12	8	41
86-90	0	11	10	8	7	8	8	11	9	72
81-85	0	6	12	7	8	12	17	10	8	80
76-80	0	2	11	10	8	8	4	4	2	49
71-75	1	8	13	3	8	8	9	8	6	64
66-70	0	9	14	10	6	12	19	15	10	95
61-65	5	3	10	4	10	7	3	6	6	54
56-60	1	14	13	6	10	16	10	9	5	84
51-55	1	3	13	14	20	25	18	13	12	119
46-50	3	35	18	17	12	12	13	14	4	128
41-45	4	7	15	11	14	15	18	16	19	119
35-40	26	10	25	25	24	28	16	17	17	188
Sub-total 1[a]	43	135	167	137	138	179	169	159	117	1244
31-34	0	0	0	0	6	12	6	2	4	30
26-30	13	6	4	3	19	7	19	15	11	97
21-25	8	4	3	13	20	21	17	18	18	122
16-20	12	19	18	17	4	11	6	5	4	96
11-15	0	2	0	2	43	64	75	35	30	251
6-10	2	10	4	6	51	44	22	29	25	193
0-5	114	141	145	153	75	51	43	153	143	1018
Sub-total 2	149	182	174	194	218	210	188	257	235	1807
Total Enrollment	192	317	341	331	356	389	357	416	352	3051

[a]Sub-total 1 gives the number of pupils, by grade level, who were eligible for Title I services.

Table 6

Number of Title I Participants by Grade and School
Spring 1975 Needs Assessment Data
Public Elementary

School	Grade K	1	2	3	4	5	6	Other[a]	Total Title I	Total Enrollment	% Title I[b]
Anwatin					67	61	85	1	214	582	37%
Bancroft				73	125	141	157	1	497	672	74
Bethune	93	85	83	53	3	1			318	477	67
Bremer					117	110	113		340	648	52
Bryn Mawr	7	9	18	9	8	11	4		66	295	22
Calhoun	15	17	28	14	8	22	26		130	408	32
Cleveland	46	45	41	31					163	266	61
Clinton	39	25	22	24	36	35	20	1	202	443	46
Corcoran	42	56	38	44	36	49	36	1	302	605	50
Greeley	37	52	53	28	33	36	29	7	275	514	54
Hall	25	35	18	32					110	222	50
Harrison	59	42	62	54	3			3	223	407	55
Hawthorne	77	61	63	61	38	60			360	525	69
Holland	15	18	17	23	68	47	45	3	236	375	63
Irving	80	44	56	44	52	60	52	10	398	586	68
Kenwood	18	26	37	28					109	415	26
Lincoln		2	4		103	92	95		296	585	51
Longfellow	21	57	60	50	49	44	40	1	322	512	63
Loring	5	23	26	25				9	88	202	44
Lowell	48	37	34	35	34	41	30		259	468	55
Lyndale	55	34	53	45	54	70	64		375	692	54
Madison	9	25	14	11	16	15	12		102	200	51
McKinley	40	37	44	51					172	330	52
Northrop	11	16	25	16	11	14	10		103	357	29
Penn	31	17	37	23					108	249	43
Putnam	49	47	54	44	53	37	42	2	328	521	63
Seward	14	25	19	24	25	44	33	3	187	471	40
Standish	103	91	105						299	514	58
Webster				1	62	66	102	16	247	473	52
Whittier	49	55	52	33	31	26	35		281	439	64
Willard	91	101	76	71					339	561	60
Total Title I	1079	1082	1139	947	1032	1082	1030	58	7449		
Total in Grade	2244	2031	2011	1819	1830	1987	1977	115		14014	
% Title I	48%	53%	57%	52%	56%	54%	52%	50%			53%

[a] Includes those for whom no grade was listed and those classified as special.

[b] These percentages are underestimates due to loss of data. See page 24.

Table 7

Number of Title I Participants by Grade and School
Spring 1975 Needs Assessment Data
Public Secondary

School	Grade 7	8	9	Other[a]	Total Title I	Total Enrollment	% Title I[b]
Bryant	128	130			258	857	30%
Bryant YES	1	10	4		15	38	39
Franklin	138	125		14	277	538	51
Jefferson	74	79	85		238	924	26
Jordan	159	195			354	739	48
North Area Learning Center	11	21			32	42	76
Phillips	129	85	87	2	303	754	42
Sheridan	75	51	75	14	215	518	42
Total Title I	715	696	251	30	1692		
Total in Grade	1832	1780	753	45		4410	
% Title I	39%	39%	33%	67%			38%

[a]Includes those for whom no grade was listed and those classified as special.

[b]These percentages are underestimates due to loss of data. See page 20.

Table 8

Number of Title I Participants by Grade and School
Spring 1975 Needs Assessment Data
Non-Public

School	Grade K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Other[a]	Total Title I	Total Enrollment	% Title I[b]
Ascension		16	22	18	32	28	30	30	13	5	1	195	380	51%
Holy Cross	1				3	27	20	15	13	2		81	357	23
Holy Rosary		4	13	6	11	8	17	8	8	1		76	182	42
Immanuel Lutheran	9	8	8	2	5	4	2	6	3			47	119	39
Incarnation	3	12	16	9	16	29	22	24	29	5		165	530	31
St. Albert	1	3	7	4	4	12	8	4	5	1		49	143	34
St. Anne	9	6	12	11	20	8	24	15	20			125	386	32
St. Austin	7	12	11	6	7	6	20	14	14	2		99	308	32
St. Bridget		6	12	15	17	25	16	19	13	1		124	369	34
St. Cyril	3	25	18	19	2							67	195	34
St. Stephen		11	18	6	10	9	13	12	9			88	164	54
South Parks	6	3	15	10	12	14	9	14	5			88	454	19
Total Title I	39	106	152	106	139	170	181	161	132	17	1	1204		
Total in Grade	231	356	377	313	420	462	443	485	437	61	2		3587	
% Title I	17%	30%	40%	34%	33%	37%	41%	33%	30%	28%				34%

[a]Includes those for whom no grade was listed and those classified as special.

[b]These percentages are underestimates due to loss of data. See page 20.

Participating students were classified according to the areas in which they showed special need of Title I services. Attention was focused on those children who were given poor or serious ratings on reading and/or math status. The number of students who received such ratings on the needs assessment variables under study is given in Table 9. These were the students included in the evaluation of the attainment of objectives reported in the Results section.

Table 9

Number of Title I Students Rated Poor or Serious on Needs Assessment Variables in Fall 1974 By Grade Level and Location[a]

Location and Grade Level	Unduplicated Count of Title I Students	Variable							
		Reading Status		Math Status		Work Study Habits		Behavior and Adjustment	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Public									
1-6	6370	5661	89	5428	85				
K-6	7449					4687	63	3832	51
7-9	1692	1345	79	1289	76	1171	69	948	56
Non-Public									
1-8	1165	1014	87	1037	89				
K-8	1204					878	73	607	50
Total									
1-9	9227	8020	87%	7754	84%				
K-9	10345					6736	65%	5387	52%

[a]Only children whose fall scores were transferred to the spring needs assessment forms are included in this table.

THE TITLE I STAFF

During 1974-75, 111.5 professional staff positions, 30.6 clerical positions and 214.5 teacher aide positions were funded by the Title I program in the Minneapolis Public Schools. Additionally, 11 teachers, 1 tutor, 3.5 other professional staff positions, a parttime clerk and 18.8 aide positions were funded by Title I in non-public schools. Table 10 shows the types of personnel employed and the schools in which they were employed. The information contained in the table was obtained from the Finance and Budget Department and the Title I Instructor-Coordinators.

Fifty-one percent of the Title I professional staff positions in the Minneapolis Public Schools were occupied by supplementary reading and math teachers and 32 percent were held by reading and math resource teachers. Most of the aides employed in both the public and non-public schools were parttime employees.

Teacher aides assisted classroom teachers in non-instructional and instructional classroom activities and performed liaison duties between the school and the community. They took attendance, corrected papers, listened to pupils read, and helped students individually and in groups. Instructional activities occurred under the supervision of certificated teachers.

Supplementary teachers diagnosed specific needs of Title I children in cooperation with the regular classroom teacher. Supplementary teachers planned individualized programs for each child in reading, math, and language development. They supervised and assisted aides, developed supplementary activities to aid children in basic skills and conducted in-service training for teachers.

Tutors provided individual instruction for Title I children and cooperated with regular classroom teachers in preparing lessons appropriate for tutoring sessions.

Job descriptions for aides, supplementary teachers and all other Title I personnel listed in the table are as described in the 1973-74 Title I Regulations and Guidelines.

Table 10

Title I Staff Positions for 1974-75

Component	Number of Staff Positions by Location					
	Teacher Aides	Supplementary Reading-Math Teachers	Tutors	Administrators	Clerical	Other
NORTH AREA SCHOOLS						
Bethune	10.3	1				
Bremer	10.6	1	.5			
Cleveland	4.4					
Hall	5.7					
Hawthorne	10.6	1.5	1		.2	
Holland	6.8	1				
Lincoln Intermediate	8	2				
Loring	1.9		.4			
Lowell	9.4	1	.3			
McKinley	3.2		1.4			
Penn	3.8	.5	.8			
Putnam	9.7					
Webster	6.2					
Willard	7.1	2.5				
North Area Reading Team	1.3				.4	10 (Reading Resource Teachers)
North Area Office					1	
Sub Total	99.0	10.5	4.4		1.6	10
WEST AREA SCHOOLS						
Anwatin	3.6	2			.5	
Bryn Mawr	.9	1				
Calhoun	2.5	1.7				
Harrison	5.2	2			.5	
Kenwood	2.8	2				
Lyndale	5.2	4				
West Area Reading Team	.7					4 (Reading Resource Teachers)
West Area Office					.5	
Sub Total	20.9	12.7			1.5	4

Table 10 (continued)

Component	Number of Staff Positions by Location					
	Teacher Aides	Supplementary Reading-Math Teachers	Tutors	Administrators	Clerical	Other
EAST AREA SCHOOLS						
Bancroft	5.1	1			1	
Clinton	3.7	2			.3	.3 (librarian)
Corcoran	5.2	4				
Greeley	6.9				.5	Greeley, Madison and Irving shared 3 math teachers (2.0 positions) and 1 aide.
Irving	7.7	.5			1	
Longfellow	2.4	2			.2	
Madison	3.7	1			.5	
Northrop	3.5					
Seward	4.8	2				
Standish	4.9				.5	
Whittier	3.7	3.2			.7	.2 (librarian)
East Area Reading Team	1.3					8 (Reading Resource Teachers)
East Area Office					.5	
Sub Total	52.9	15.7			5.2	10.5 and 1 aide
SECONDARY SCHOOLS						
Bryant	2.8	3			1	
Bryant Y.E.S. Center	1.9	3	1	1	1	
Franklin	4.8	1				
Jefferson	2.8	1			1	
Jordan	7.2	2				
North Area Learning Center		.8	.7	1		4 (teachers)
Phillips	1.8	3.7				
Sheridan	.6	2	2			
Sub Total	21.9	16.5	3.7	2	3	4
SYSTEM WIDE SUPPORT SERVICES						
Basic Skill Centers	16.8					
Basic Skill Extension Centers	1.9	2				
Elementary Math Team	.1			1	1	4 (Math Resource Teachers)
Instructional Materials Center (including Cassette Project)				1	7.8	5.5 (3.5 duplicating machine operators, 2 resource teachers)

Table 10 (continued)

Component	Number of Staff Positions by Location					
	Teacher Aides	Supplementary Reading-Math Teachers	Tutors	Administrators	Clerical	Other
SYSTEM WIDE SUPPORT SERVICES (continued)						
Instructional Supp. Serv. and Dissemination				3	1	
Math Basic Skills Development					1	.8 (2 teachers on special assignment)
Research and Evaluation				.3	3	1.7 (evaluators)
Teacher Aide Support				.7	2	1 (2 teachers on special assignment)
Sub Total	18.8	2		6	15.8	13
TOTAL PUBLIC SCHOOL	213.5	57.4	8.1	8	27.1	41.5
NON-PUBLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS						
Ascension	3.7	2				
Basilica	.5					
Holy Cross	2.1					
Holy Rosary	1.6	1				All non-public schools shared the services of a psychologist (1.0), academic diagnostic specialist (1.0), speech therapist (1.0), tutor (.5) and a clerk (.6).
Immanuel Lutheran	.1	1	1			
Incarnation		.5				
St. Albert	1.5					
St. Anne	3.7	1				
St. Austin		1				
St. Bridget	1.1	1				
St. Cyril	1.1					
St. Stephen	2.3	2				
South Park Consolidated	1.1	1				
Total Non-Public	18.8	10.5	1			4.1
GRAND TOTAL	232.3	67.9	9.1	8	27.1	45.6

The Title I staff members had, or developed, special competence for working with Title I children. Many staff members had previous experience in the Target schools. Most of the teacher aides lived in the neighborhoods of the schools they served. All of the staff received in-service training provided by the city-wide services and area services, as well as by individual components. The North Area Reading Team, Franklin Junior High, St. Bridget's, East Area Reading Team, Holy Rosary, Webster, West Area Reading Team, Calhoun, Basic Skill Centers, Basic Skill Extension Centers, Math Basic Skills Development Project, Math Team, and Non-Public School Special Education components were listed as providing in-service training. The Teacher Aide Support and Inservice Training also gave such training.

An extensive in-service program was conducted during the summer of 1974 for teachers and aides who were to be in Title I public elementary schools in 1974-75. Those inservices were planned by aides, teachers, and administrators.

The in-service program was expanded during the 1974-75 school year on receipt of funds from ESEA Title I, Part C.

PARENT INVOLVEMENT

The Minneapolis Public Schools Parent Advisory Committee (PAC) was established in 1970. PAC membership has grown from 8 in 1970 to 53, of whom 12 were from non-public schools, in 1974-75. There were an additional 29 alternate members of the committee. All Title I schools were represented on the committee with the exception of two small special location junior highs. Recruitment of parents whose children were Title I eligible was emphasized.

Seven of the ten regular PAC meetings were city-wide in scope. Area meetings were held in November, March, and May. An additional meeting for orientation of new members was held in October. The meetings were held on the third Wednesday of each month, except July and August, in various locations. They started at 7:15 P.M. and generally ended at 9:15 although twice the meetings lasted until 9:50. Title I staff members and other administrators were present at all meetings in a resource capacity. They were not allowed to vote at any time. Average attendance at the city-wide meetings was 32 members.

The budget for the PAC in 1974-75 was $2,000, of which $1,300 had been spent by April 2, 1975. Meeting costs, including necessary baby-sitting or transportation costs but excluding refreshments, were covered by the budgeted amount.

A review of the minutes for the meetings, which are on file in the Minneapolis Public Schools Federal Projects Office, showed that the Committee was concerned with Title I research results, summer school review, PAC constitution and bylaws, legislative matters, fiscal reports, PAC orientation for new members, needs assessment, program visitation, comparability, and review and approval of the Title I Application for Grant, FY 1976.

BUDGET

Information about Title I budgets from fiscal year (FY) 1967 through 1975 is presented in Tables 11-15. Budgeted funds, not actual expenditures, are shown. This analysis gives only a partial picture of Title I budgets because addenda, reallocations or summer budgets are not included.

Table 11 shows the breakdown of each annual budget into three categories: evaluation, direct program services and indirect program services. Table 11 gives the amount of funds budgeted while Table 12 shows the percentage of funds budgeted for each of these three purposes.

These tables do not present information directly related to federal accounting categories. The information is based on an analysis of the functions for which funds were budgeted. Thus, program and project evaluation costs are included in evaluation, direct instructional services to children are called direct program services. Indirect program services include administration, instructional support services, dissemination, monitoring and, in 1974 and 1975, indirect costs.

Total Title I funds dropped from 1967 to 1969; since then they have risen steadily. The number of Title I children eligible to receive funds has also risen each year since 1969.

Funds allocated for direct program services followed the same pattern as total funds, dropping through 1969 and then rising. The budgets for indirect program services did not follow a consistent pattern while evaluation budgets dropped steadily from 1971 through FY 1974. The percentage of all funds allocated for direct program services ranged from

Table 11

Title I Funds Budgeted for Direct Program Services, Indirect Program Services, and Evaluation for Fiscal Years 1967-1975

FY	Direct Program Services	Indirect Program Services[a]	Evaluation	All Funds
1967	$1,622,595	$110,250	$ 74,598	$1,807,443
1968	1,491,887	176,776	93,533	1,762,196
1969	1,396,384	157,677	69,950	1,620,011
1970	1,401,629	272,449	89,829	1,763,907
1971	1,727,891	196,533	108,056	2,032,480
1972	2,103,929	240,234	104,505	2,448,668
1973	2,483,858	309,547	97,337	2,890,742
1974	2,637,980	303,855	96,911	3,038,746
1975	3,031,279	300,211	112,928	3,444,418

NB: Only regular school year allocations are included. Addenda, reallocations and summer budgets are excluded.

[a]Includes administration, instructional support services, dissemination, and monitoring costs as well as indirect costs.

Table 12

Percentage of Title I Funds Budgeted for Direct Program Services, Indirect Program Services, and Evaluation for Fiscal Years 1967-1975

FY	Direct Program Services	Indirect Program Services [a]	Evaluation	Total
1967	90%	6%	4%	100%
1968	85	10	5	100
1969	86	10	4	100
1970	80	15	5	100
1971	85	10	5	100
1972	86	10	4	100
1973	86	11	3	100
1974	87	10	3	100
1975	88	9	3	100

NB: Only regular school year allocations are included.

[a] Includes administration, instructional support services, dissemination, and monitoring as well as indirect costs.

80% to 90%. Indirect program service costs ranged from 6% to 15% and evaluation budgets from 3% to 5%, over the years.

Since 1973, budgeting appears to have reached a stable pattern. One might say that typically, out of each Title I dollar, about 87 cents would be budgeted for direct program services, ten cents for indirect program services and three cents for evaluation.

How are program funds spent? What kinds of projects get the most money? Does more money go to elementary or secondary school projects? To reading or math projects? This section provides some of the answers. Again, budgeted amounts, not actual expenditures, are used for the analysis.

Table 13 gives the amount, in thousands of dollars, and the percentage of all program funds budgeted for elementary and secondary programs. Some budget allocations could not be separated and are labeled combined elementary/secondary. Readers may note some discrepancies between the amounts and percentages listed for 1973 and 1974 in Tables 13-15 in this year's report and the amounts and percentages listed for those years in the 1973-74 report. This is the result of the recategorization of two programs, the IMC and the Non-Public Schools Special Education Program, from elementary to combined elementary/secondary.

On the surface it appears that a great change in program allocations occurred in 1973. In that year 59% of the program budget was allocated for elementary programs and 12% for combined elementary/secondary programs. In the previous year, 1972, 37% of the budget was allocated for elementary programs and 44% for combined elementary/secondary programs. This difference, however, appears to be largely the result of a change in accounting procedures. Prior to 1973 funds used to pay the salaries of teacher aides and Special Learning and Behavior Problems (SLBP) teachers were "broken out" in a lump sum and it was thus impossible to identify how much was spent for elementary or secondary aides and teachers. In 1973, however, accounting methods were changed and teachers and aides were identified by school. This procedure resulted in a substantially larger amount and percentage of Title I program funds that could be identified as being spent for elementary programs. Even this breakdown underestimates the percentage of funds budgeted for elementary programs since most of the recipients of the services provided by programs categorized as combined elementary/secondary were, in fact, elementary students.

Table 13

Amount and Percentage of Title I Program Funds Budgeted for Elementary and Secondary Programs for Fiscal Years 1967-1975
(thousands of dollars)

FY	Elementary		Secondary		Combined Elementary/ Secondary		All Program Funds	
	$	%	$	%	$	%	$	%
1967	584	36	573	35	465	29	1,623	100
1968	641	43	551	37	299	20	1,492	100
1969	487	35	339	24	569	41	1,396	100
1970	451	32	286	20	664	47	1,402	99
1971	656	38	301	17	771	45	1,728	100
1972	776	37	408	19	920	44	2,104	100
1973	1,458	59	718	29	308	12	2,484	100
1974	1,674	63	650	25	314	12	2,638	100
1975	2,203	73	468	15	360	12	3,031	100

NB: Only regular school year allocations are included. Addenda, reallocations, and summer budgets are excluded.

While the greatest percentage increase in elementary program funding is probably due to this change in accounting procedure, there is evidence in Table 13 to suggest that greater emphasis has been placed on elementary programs in the last few years than in the early years of Title I. The percentage of Title I funds allocated for elementary programs increased from 59% in FY 1973 to 73% in FY 1975. In the same period the percentage of Title I funds allocated for secondary programs decreased from 29% to 15%. Currently nearly three-fourths of all Title I funds are allocated for elementary school programs and one-fourth is allocated for secondary or combined elementary and secondary programs.

Table 14 shows how elementary, secondary and elementary/secondary program funds were allocated among five program categories: non-identified basic skills, reading, math, special education, and other programs. For purposes of this analysis non-identified basic skills were defined as all Title I programs involved with remedial reading and math basic skills instruction, e.g., an aide program in which the aide assisted with both reading and math instruction. This category does not include those reading or math programs that could be specifically identified. The special education category includes various special education projects and funding for SLBP teachers. Other programs includes art and music programs, health and lunch programs, funding for teacher aides, in some instances, and programs that could not be placed elsewhere.

Table 15 shows that the percentage of the elementary program funds going to basic skills (reading, math, and non-identified basic skills) rose from about 37% in the early years of Title I funding to 100% in recent years. One reason for the apparent sharp increase in the percentage of elementary budgets allocated for basic skills in the past three years was the change in accounting procedures previously discussed in this analysis. Despite accounting changes, the increased emphasis on basic skills funding at the elementary level was real. Substantial reduction in the percentage of funds allocated for "other" programs and special education took place.

The apparent drop in emphasis on basic skills in FY 1969 at the secondary level, as seen in Tables 14 and 15, is spurious. "Other

Table 14

Amount of Title I Funds Budgeted for Reading, Mathematics, and Other Programs: Fiscal Years 1967-75

FY	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975
ELEMENTARY									
Non-Identified Basic Skills	$234,704	$225,866	$181,385	$193,933	$220,301	$297,368	$1,089,196	$1,119,448	$1,505,267
Reading					231,873	218,702	293,788	410,786	514,996
Math				61,463	70,301	62,101	75,000	143,619	182,302
Special Education	104,481	128,373	101,357	126,539		158,499			
Other Programs	245,275	286,935	204,587	69,529	133,770	39,032			
ELEMENTARY TOTAL	584,460	641,174	487,329	451,464	656,245	775,702	1,457,984	1,673,853	2,202,565
SECONDARY									
Non-Identified Basic Skills	483,107	457,650	166,829	166,847	212,217	211,454	408,342	312,404	116,414
Reading	8,932			3,990	4,570	86,531	106,031	122,333	131,130
Math								37,908	66,662
Special Education	17,356	17,605	33,537	47,319					
Other Programs	63,374	76,334	138,964	115,458	84,009[a]	110,358[a]	203,976[a]	177,620[a]	154,135[a]
SECONDARY TOTAL	572,769	551,589	339,330	286,295	300,796	408,343	718,349	650,265	468,341
ELEMENTARY/SECONDARY									
Non-Identified Basic Skills									
Reading				22,902			129,987	136,248	110,141
Math						31,888	39,982		
Special Education	140,434	70,616			151,841			31,106[b]	53,270[b]
Other Programs	324,932	228,508	569,725	640,968	619,009	887,996	137,556	146,508	196,962
ELEMENTARY/SECONDARY TOTAL	465,366	299,124	569,725	663,870	770,850	919,884	307,525	313,862	360,373
GRAND TOTAL	1,622,595	1,491,887	1,396,384	1,401,629	1,727,891	2,103,929	2,483,858	2,637,980	3,031,279

NB: Only regular school year allocations are included. Addenda, reallocations and summer budgets are excluded.

[a]Includes only funds budgeted for Bryant YES Center and North Area Learning Center.

[b]Includes only non-public schools.

Table 15

Percentage of Program Funds Budgeted for Reading, Mathematics, and Other Programs: Fiscal Years 1967-75

FY	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975
ELEMENTARY									
Non-Identified Basic Skills	40%	35%	37%	54%	34%	38%	75%	67%	68%
Reading					35%	28%	20%	25%	23%
Math				11%	11%	8%	5%	9%	8%
Special Education	18%	20%	21%	23%		20%			
Other Programs	42%	45%	42%	12%	20%	5%			
ELEMENTARY TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	101%	99%
SECONDARY									
Non-Identified Basic Skills	84%	83%	49%	60%	71%	52%	58%	48%	25%
Reading	2%			1%	2%	21%	14%	19%	28%
Math								6%	14%
Special Education	3%	3%	10%						
Other Programs	11%	14%	41%	40%	28%[a]	27%[a]	28%[a]	27%[a]	33%[a]
SECONDARY TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
ELEMENTARY/SECONDARY									
Non-Identified Basic Skills									
Reading				3%			42%	43%	31%
Math						3%	13%		
Special Education	30%	24%			20%			10%[b]	15%[b]
Other Programs	70%	76%	100%	97%	80%	97%	45%	47%	55%
ELEMENTARY/SECONDARY TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	101%

NB: Only regular school year allocations are included. Addenda, reallocations and summer budgets are excluded.

[a]Includes only funds budgeted for Bryant YES Center and North Area Learning Center.

[b]Includes only non-public schools.

programs" funding in the 1969 and 1970 secondary budgets included two projects, North Area Learning Center (formerly Lincoln Learning Center) and Bryant Youth Educational Support Center (Bryant YES) which have a heavy emphasis on the basic skills. Since FY 1971, funds going to "other" secondary programs have included only those two projects. If the proportion of funds devoted to basic skills could be broken out of the "other" budget it is possible that the percentage of the secondary budget for basic skills would rise to 80% or 90%.

While most funds go to non-identified basic skills projects it may be of interest to look at the differences in funding for reading and mathematics projects. Since FY 1971, as Table 15 shows, the percentage of program funds devoted to reading projects in elementary schools has ranged from 20% to 35%. Math funds have ranged from 5% to 11%. In the secondary schools, reading funds have ranged from 1% to 28%. Funds exclusively for math were not identified until 1971 when six percent was allotted; in 1975, 14% was allotted. In general, from three to four times as much money has been budgeted for reading as has been budgeted for math. The bulk of the funds, however, were budgeted for combined reading and math projects.

In summary, this analysis has shown that in FY 1975 about 87 cents of each Title I dollar was budgeted for direct program services. Nearly three-fourths of program funds were budgeted for elementary school programs, all of which was devoted to basic skills instruction.

PROCEDURES

Extra basic skills instruction was given to Title I children (those whose composite needs assessment scores were 35 or higher) who were one or more years below grade level in reading and/or math. Because of the decentralization of the Minneapolis Public Schools the source of the supplementary instruction can be classified as either decentralized or centralized services.

Decentralized services were administered by the three area superintendents. Nearly 75% of the Title I funds were distributed by these superintendents. Areas used the money for the Title I Reading Teams and compensatory services in all Title I schools. The reading teams from

each area worked together to create extra teaching materials and helped teach in-service training courses. Each team visited classrooms in its own area to demonstrate teaching techniques and use of materials. The use of Title I funds varied among the different schools depending on the grade level of the children to be served and the aspect of the Title I program which the school emphasized. Schools used their funds for teacher aides, supplementary reading or math teachers and additional supplies needed for implementation of Title I programs.

Centralized services included the Basic Skill Centers, Basic Skill Extension Centers, Cassette Program, Instructional Materials Center, Mathematics Basic Skills Development Project, Math Team (elementary), and Non-Public Schools Special Education. Description of these components is in the section of this report entitled Historical Background and Development of the Title I Program in Minneapolis.

Improvement of the basic skills of reading and mathematics was the goal of the total Title I program. Both the decentralized and centralized services focussed on these skills.

Reading skills were emphasized more than math skills in the elementary grades. This is shown by the amounts budgeted for reading (see Budget section) and by the amount of time allocated to the subject in the classroom. Reading, in the Minneapolis Public Schools, is subsumed under the larger category of Language Arts. In the schedules for grades 1-6 the time allotted to reading instruction, as such, decreased as the time for language arts, including oral and written expression, increased. In the first grade, two and three-quarters hours were scheduled for language arts each day, two hours of which were for reading instruction. By third grade the time spent on reading instruction decreased to an hour and a half with nearly an hour for additional language arts. In grades 4-6 the time allotted the two areas of instruction were about equal with an hour for each.

The basal reading texts used in the target area elementary schools were The Read Series[3] published by the American Book Company (ABC). The

[3]Various editions of the texts named in this section are used in the schools. Exact references, including publication dates, are not given here but are available on request.

ABC texts were used throughout the target schools so that the highly mobile Title I children would have fewer problems in moving from one school to another. Supplementary texts, workbooks and special supplies were provided by Title I funds. Much of this additional material was developed by the Title I Reading Team. The general thrust of the reading program stressed small group and individualized instruction through the use of supplementary teachers, tutors, and teacher aides. Secondary students who were eligible for Title I assistance in reading received instruction from special programs such as the English Basic Skills project at Phillips, the Basic Skill Centers and Extension Centers, the Bryant YES Center and the North Area Learning Center.

The time allotted for mathematics instruction increased from grade 1 to grade 6 as the time scheduled for language arts decreased. In grades 1-3 from 20 to 30 minutes daily was usually spent on math. This time increased to 45-50 minutes in grades 4-6. Houghton-Mifflin mathematics texts were widely, though not universally, used in the Title I schools. A few schools based their instruction on the SRA series. All of the schools used supplementary materials which were either commercially produced or developed by the Math Team and produced, as were reading materials, by the Instructional Materials Center. Individualized or small group instruction was given in the classroom, math labs and other rooms by aides, tutors, and supplementary teachers. Secondary students, who spent from 45 to 55 minutes daily in math classrooms, and were Title I eligible, made use of Mathematics Basic Skills Development Project workbooks and kits. These materials did not constitute the whole math curriculum but were supplementary to programs in the different schools. Two widely used texts in junior high were the Houghton-Mifflin Modern School Mathematics, Structure and Method, and Addison-Wesley's School Mathematics.

Complete lists of texts and materials used in the Title I schools may be obtained from the Minneapolis Schools.[4] Computerized lists of Title I equipment as of May 1975 can also be obtained from the same source.

[4] Federal Programs, Minneapolis Public Schools, 807 N. E. Broadway, Minneapolis, Minnesota. 55413

MEASURING DEVICES

The standardized achievement tests and criterion-referenced tests used to evaluate gains in reading and mathematics will be specified by name and grade level in the addendum to this report which will be prepared when the fall city-wide testing has been completed.

The Federal Projects Needs Assessment Survey, a mandatory State developed survey, described in an earlier section, is the sole measuring device for which results are given in this report. It was used to meet State of Minnesota Department of Education, Title I, requirements. Evidence of the rationale for and reliability of teacher judgments is not available. Detailed instructions for the teachers who completed the forms served as guidelines for judgments of pupil development, reading and math status, and ratings of work habits, behavior and adjustment. (See Section F on page 23.) Whether these instructions provided uniform standards of judgment for all Title I teachers is not known at this time.

RESULTS

The findings presented in this section pertain only to data obtained from the Federal Projects Needs Assessment Survey which was conducted in May 1975. The survey included teacher judgments made in the fall of 1974. Possible reasons for the discrepancies between the "Estimated N" and "Actual N" columns in the following tables will be included in the Discussion section. The general objective evaluated precedes each table. The numbers and percentages for each objective are given, by specified grade levels as written in the proposal for FY 1975, in tabular form for ease of comparison with the actual figures for the 1974-75 year. Only students whose fall composite needs assessment ratings were 35 or above and who also were rated in the spring are included.

READING

As measured pre-post with the Title I Needs Assessment Rating Scale for pupil status in reading, of the ~~estimated~~ (Estimated N) children rated poor or serious by their regular classroom teacher in fall, 1974 (Objective %) % will be rated at least one level higher in the spring on the Title I Needs Assessment Rating Scale.

Table 16

Reading Results

Grade	Number Rated Poor or Serious in Fall		% Rated at Least One Level Higher	
	Estimated N	Actual N	Objective %	Actual %
Public				
K-1	2010	1046[a]	60	29
2-6	5331	4615	55	38
7-9	1755	1345	51	44
Non-Public				
K-1	109	100[a]	50	43
2-8	771	914	47	36
Total	9976	8020	55%	37%

[a]Kindergarten students were not rated on reading status.

The objectives which had been set for reading were not reached, according to data obtained from the Needs Assessment Rating Scale. From 29% to 44% of the children were rated one level higher in spring 1975 on reading status, by their teachers, than they had been rated in the previous fall although the stated objectives had ranged from 47% to 60%. These figures give no indication of the percentages of children whose ratings shifted from poor to average, or those whose ratings changed from serious to poor or average.

MATHEMATICS

As measured pre-post with the Title I Needs Assessment Rating Scale for pupil status in math, of the estimated (Estimated N) children rated poor or serious by their regular classroom teacher in fall, 1974 (Objective %) % will be rated at least one level higher in the spring on the Title I Needs Assessment Rating Scale.

Table 17

Mathematics Results

Grade	Number Rated Poor or Serious in Fall		% Rated at Least One Level Higher	
	Estimated N	Actual N	Objective %	Actual %
Public				
K-1	1744	984[a]	56	35
2-6	5141	4444	62	41
7-9	1681	1289	51	43
Non-Public				
K-1	106	93[a]	51	34
2-8	715	944	52	33
Total	9387	7754	58%	39%

[a]Kindergarten students were not rated on mathematics status.

The mathematics objectives, as given in the FY 1975 application for grant, were not met. The 7-9 grade group came the closest to reaching the goal which had been set for it; the actual percentage of those who were rated at least one level higher in math status was 8% below the percentage given as the objective for those grade levels. The actual percentages for the other groups were from 17% to 21% below the objectives which had been set for them.

WORK STUDY HABITS

Of the children listed as the unduplicated count, an estimated (Estimated N) were rated poor or serious in work habits in the fall, 1974 on the Needs Assessment, (Objective %) % of these will be rated at least one level higher by their classroom teacher in the spring as measured by the Title I Needs Assessment Rating Scale.

Table 18

Work Study Habits Results

Grade	Number Rated Poor or Serious in Fall		% Rated at Least One Level Higher	
	Estimated N	Actual N	Objective %	Actual %
Public				
K-6	5990	4687	59	43
7-9	1633	1171	55	38
Non-Public				
K-8	667	878	52	38
Total	8290	6736	58%	42%

The percentages of children who had been rated poor or serious in the fall on their work study habits and were rated one level higher by their teachers in the spring were below those stated in the objectives by from 14% to 17%. There was no component of the Title I program directly concerned with improving work study habits.

BEHAVIOR AND ADJUSTMENT

Of the children listed as the unduplicated count, an estimated (Estimated N) were rated poor or serious in behavior and adjustment in the fall, 1974 on the Needs Assessment, (Objective %) % of these will be rated at least one level higher by their classroom teacher in the spring as measured by the Title I Needs Assessment Rating Scale.

Table 19

Behavior and Adjustment Results

Grade	Number Rated Poor or Serious in Fall		% Rated at Least One Level Higher	
	Estimated N	Actual N	Objective %	Actual %
Public				
K-6	5160	3832	61	42
7-9	1445	,948	49	45
Non-Public				
K-8	552	607	50	41
Total	7157	5387	58%	42%

The public school junior high group came the closest to meeting the objective set for it in behavior and adjustment; the percentage of students who were rated one level higher was 4% below the stated objective. The non-public school group failed to meet its objective by 9%, and the public K-6 group fell 19% below attainment of its goal. Although efforts were made in both public and non-public schools to help children who had behavior or adjustment problems, such efforts were not, in general, a part of the Title I program which focussed on improvement in the basic skills.

DISCUSSION

Trend analyses of achievement test data comparing median raw scores of Title I and non-Title I schools have been presented in Minneapolis evaluation reports in previous years. Such trend analyses are no longer suitable.

Desegregation of Minneapolis elementary schools in 1974-75 resulted in shifts of student populations and an increased number of Title I schools. Eleven additional schools were classified as Title I and five of the previous year's Title I schools were closed (see Table 2 on page 7).

With desegregation, the percentage of eligible children ranged from 22 percent to 74 percent in the various public elementary Title I schools. Evaluation of the effects of Title I programs on individual pupils, rather than on total school populations, became necessary. Also, relation of needs assessment data to achievement test gains was called for by the State of Minnesota in its Uniform District Application For Grant. Analyzing such relationships will require individual, rather than school, information. Because of these changes, this report and the addendum on achievement test gains will not be directly comparable to the evaluations of the Minneapolis Title I program in past years.

Needs assessment data have previously been collected to select eligible students for Title I services but the data have not been used to evaluate the Title I program in Minneapolis Public and non-Public schools. In the FY 75 Uniform Application, objectives were established for pupils who were rated as poor or serious on the needs assessment instrument which contained four categories of need: reading, math, work study habits, behavior and adjustment. Discrepancies occurred in the number of pupils for which objectives were established and the number of pupils on which this report is based.

The actual numbers upon which this report is based are smaller than the estimates, in large part, because of the changeover to the optically read needs assessment survey form that was used in May 1975. Teachers had to record, manually, the fall ratings of the children on the new forms. October needs assessment data were not recorded for about 16 percent of

the children although more than half of this group had been in the school system at that time as evidenced by the fact that fall city-wide test scores were on record for them. Whether lack of full data was due to misplacement of student records in transfer between schools, reluctance of teachers to look up old forms, or to some other cause is not known.

The discrepancies between the percentages of pupils rated at least one level higher on the needs assessment scale and the percentages which had been set as objectives may be due, in part, to the fact that there was no empirical basis for setting realistic objectives in terms of the scale. Assessment of student needs had not been done on a pre-post schedule before 1974-75 nor had the gains of individual students been tabulated. Additionally, no information on the validity or reliability of the needs assessment scale is available.

Recommendations will be made once achievement test gains have been evaluated in terms of the stated objectives of the program. Fall 1974 achievement test scores will be related to fall 1975 test scores for those pupils who were rated poor or serious in reading and/or math on the October 1974 needs assessment survey. These further analyses will probably not be completed until early 1976 because of the necessary delay in obtaining the fall 1975 test results.

Minneapolis Public Schools

Research and Evaluation Department
Planning and Support Services Division

Marshall Kaner
Assistant Superintendent for
Planning and Support Services Division

Richard W. Faunce
Director of Research and Evaluation

Lary R. Johnson
Coordinator of Desegregation and
Reorganization Studies

Robert L. Bergeth
Research Specialist

Sara H. Clark
Research Specialist

Paul Higgins
Research Specialist

Bonna Nesset
Administrative Assistant

Al Pierson
Public Information Assistant

Tom McCormick
Contracted Evaluator

Clerical Staff

Diane I. Boardman
Judy A. Bolduc
Lorraine T. Dunkley
Delores J. McPhail