

## DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 134 654

UD 016 712

TITLE The Tenth Annual Evaluation Report of Title I in Ohio, Fiscal Year 1975.

INSTITUTION Ohio State Dept. of Education, Columbus.

PUB DATE Nov 75

NOTE 31p.

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.83 HC-\$2.06 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS Compensatory Education Programs; Elementary Secondary Education; Federal Programs; Inservice Programs; \*Mathematics; Parent Participation; Program Content; Program Costs; \*Program Descriptions; Program Effectiveness; \*Program Evaluation; \*Reading Programs; \*Tables (Data)

IDENTIFIERS \*Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I; ESEA Title I; \*Ohio

## ABSTRACT

This report contains twenty-four tables which present data on Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Title I-funded projects for the state of Ohio. Major instructional areas are: reading, mathematics, vocational education, tutorial services, pre-school education, and special education. Reading and mathematics evaluation data are presented in terms of the degree of achievement change as measured by standardized tests. Degree of change is defined in terms of the following criteria: marked improvement, improvement, some improvement, and little or no improvement. (Author/AM)

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\* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished \*  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

ED134654

THE TENTH ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT  
OF TITLE I IN OHIO

FISCAL YEAR 1975

Arlie E. Cox, Assistant Director, Division of Federal Assistance  
Carl E. Evans, Educational Consultant

G. ROBERT BOWERS  
Assistant Superintendent, Instruction

R. A. HORN, Director  
Division of Federal Assistance

STATE OF OHIO  
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
Columbus, Ohio

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,  
EDUCATION & WELFARE  
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF  
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

November, 1975

ED016712

State Board of Education

William H. Cossler, Youngstown, President  
Everett L. Jung, M.D., Hamilton, Vice-President  
Martha B. Agler, Columbus  
William M. Baker, Madison  
Wallace E. Blake, Zanesville  
Walter A. Burks, Jr., Cleveland  
Thaddeus Garrett, Jr., Akron  
Susan D. George, Canton  
Robert W. Grosser, Strongsville  
Daniel Jankowski, Maple Heights  
William M. Judd, Cincinnati  
Robert A. Lyons, Sr., Dayton  
Roy D. McKinley, Coshocton  
John R. Meckstroth, Cincinnati  
Ward M. Miller, Portsmouth  
David R. Rittenhouse, Toledo  
Anthony Russo, Mayfield Heights  
Ruth S. Schildhouse, Columbus  
Wayne E. Shaffer, Bryan  
Cecil M. Sims, Piqua  
Robert W. Walker, Adena  
Robert E. Williams, Xenia  
Martha W. Wise, Elyria

## INTRODUCTION

Programs for educationally disadvantaged pupils are continually being made available to school districts through the provisions of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

Funds are allocated to local educational agencies for programs to provide instruction and services to disadvantaged pupils who live in attendance areas where low-income families are concentrated.

Nearly all public school districts in Ohio qualify for Title I but in order for school districts to participate, they must comply with the existing Federal Regulations.

The following procedures must be initiated prior to implementing a Title I program:

1. Identify attendance areas to be served.
2. Have existing Parent Advisory Councils.
3. Assess the educational needs of children living in eligible attendance areas.
4. Formulate a plan for instructional and service activities to meet these needs.
5. Submit a project application to the state for approval and funding.

The following procedures are necessary either during or after a program to provide concentrated instruction tailored to the needs of the child has been approved and established:

1. Maintain fiscal records.
2. Evaluate the programs.
3. Provide an opportunity for participation by all parents of Title I students.
4. Demonstrate and maintain comparability.
5. Disseminate information concerning the program.

The purpose of Title I evaluation is to provide some sound basis for determining whether or not programs should be modified, strengthened, or shifted in terms of objectives. Evaluation is a necessary tool to secure evidence to determine the impact of Title I on the disadvantaged youth.

The Federal Regulations for Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 require that programs be evaluated annually at local, state, and federal levels. In order to comply with these Regulations, the Basic Program Section of the Division of Federal Assistance prepared evaluation instruments which have been completed by local evaluators. The composite of information was summarized so that state-level evaluation results could be made available to the U. S. Office of Education.

The purpose of this document is to give a concise report of the Title I activities in Ohio during fiscal year 1975. Information presented includes student achievement data, basic statistics, expenditure patterns, participant involvement, major instructional areas, staffing, parent participation and advisory councils, state administration, and four-year trends.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction . . . . .	1
Basic Statistics . . . . .	1
Number and Percentage by Major Instructional Areas . . . . .	2
Public School District Patterns . . . . .	3
Student Participation, Regular Term . . . . .	4
Student Participation, Summer Term . . . . .	5
Student Participation, Unduplicated by Grade Level . . . . .	6
Student Participation by Instructional Area . . . . .	7
Student-Teacher Ratio . . . . .	8
Professional and Non-Professional Personnel . . . . .	9
Inservice Training Activities . . . . .	10
Non-public School Participation . . . . .	11
Parental Involvement . . . . .	13
Achievement Evaluation . . . . .	14
Expenditure Patterns . . . . .	18
State of Ohio Compensatory Program (DPPF) . . . . .	21
State Educational Agency Involvement . . . . .	23
Individual Success Stories . . . . .	24

# BASIC STATISTICS FOR OHIO TITLE I, ESEA, PROGRAMS

Total number of LEAs in Ohio . . . . .	617
Number of Title I projects conducted during fiscal year 1975 . . . . .	599
Number of LEAs participating in Title I . . . . .	596
Number of LEAs participating in Title I during the regular school term only . . . . .	524
Number of LEAs participating in Title I during the summer term only . . . . .	15
Number of LEAs participating in Title I during both the regular and summer terms . . . . .	57
Total unduplicated number of participants in Title I programs . . . . .	130,361

Fiscal year 1975 final allocation . . . . .	\$50,025,141
Fiscal year 1974 Part "C" final allocation . . . . .	1,344,446
Total allocation available . . . . .	\$51,369,587

## Reported expenditures from:

Fiscal year 1975 funds . . . . .	37,326,192
Fiscal year 1974 carry-over funds . . . . .	13,411,643
Fiscal year 1974 Part "C" carry-over funds . . . . .	1,302,319
Fiscal year 1973 carry-over funds . . . . .	2,491,343
Total Title I expenditures reported for fiscal year 1975 . . . . .	\$54,531,497

TABLE 1. NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF MAJOR INSTRUCTIONAL AREAS IN 586 REGULAR TERM AND 75 SUMMER TERM TITLE I PROJECTS

Major Instructional Areas	Regular Term		Summer Term	
	LEAs	Percent	LEAs	Percent
Reading . . . . .	555	94.7	60	80.0
Mathematics . . . . .	46	7.8	23	31.0
Vocational Education . . . . .	2	.3	2	.3
Tutorial Services . . . . .	32	5.4	6	8.1
Preschool Education . . . . .	20	3.4	8	10.8
Special Education . . . . .	9	1.5	3	4.0



TABLE 2. PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICT PATTERNS RELEVANT TO THE AVAILABILITY AND PROVISION OF TITLE I SERVICES

Public School District Patterns	Reported Totals
Public school buildings in participating LEAs which qualify for Title I services . . . . .	2,612
Qualified buildings receiving Title I services . . . . .	2,042
Qualified buildings not receiving Title I services . . . . .	570
Qualified students not receiving Title I services during fiscal year 1975 . . . . .	235,225

TABLE 3. FOUR-YEAR COMPARISON OF TITLE I, PART A ALLOCATIONS

Fiscal Year	ADC Children Used For Allocation	Total ADC Ages 5-17	Total Number of Children Used For Allocation	Amounts of Allocation Per Child	State Allocation
1972	113,416	174,056	268,159	\$148.95	\$41,269,978.00
1973	137,774	221,537	301,678	156.70	47,271,922.00
1974	146,540	239,957	265,208	170.74	45,280,413.00
1975	4,473	244,509	292,062	171.28	50,025,141.00

TABLE 4. PARTICIPATION OF REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR TITLE I PUPILS BY  
GRADE LEVELS FOR A FOUR-YEAR PERIOD

Grade Levels	REGULAR TERM			
	Fiscal Year 1972	Fiscal Year 1973	Fiscal Year 1974	Fiscal Year 1975
Pre-Kindergarten . . . . .	5,624	5,441	5,522	5,810
Kindergarten . . . . .	4,054	3,924	4,772	6,248
Grade 1 . . . . .	16,327	16,284	16,824	18,950
Grade 2 . . . . .	21,872	22,083	22,458	24,301
Grade 3 . . . . .	19,209	19,020	19,496	20,790
Grade 4 . . . . .	13,026	12,758	13,182	17,434
Grade 5 . . . . .	9,511	9,001	9,370	12,429
Grade 6 . . . . .	7,714	6,658	6,854	8,786
Grade 7 . . . . .	5,417	3,989	2,960	3,205
Grade 8 . . . . .	2,286	1,366	1,016	1,358
Grade 9 . . . . .	1,369	472	324	393
Grade 10 . . . . .	798	269	152	171
Grade 11 . . . . .	379	147	58	106
Grade 12 . . . . .	295	67	21	49
Non-Graded . . . . .		865	786	
TOTALS . . . . .	107,881	102,344	103,795	120,030

TABLE 5. PARTICIPATION OF SUMMER TERM TITLE I PUPILS BY GRADE LEVELS  
FOR A FOUR-YEAR PERIOD

Grade Levels	SUMMER TERM			
	Fiscal Year 1972	Fiscal Year 1973	Fiscal Year 1974	Fiscal Year 1975
Pre-Kindergarten . . . . .	2,843	1,815	2,613	1,829
Kindergarten . . . . .	2,499	1,937	990	1,337
Grade 1 . . . . .	6,643	5,058	3,968	2,788
Grade 2 . . . . .	7,084	5,128	3,978	3,104
Grade 3 . . . . .	5,999	4,437	3,543	3,030
Grade 4 . . . . .	5,180	3,512	2,872	2,501
Grade 5 . . . . .	3,879	2,781	2,409	2,219
Grade 6 . . . . .	3,208	2,637	1,896	1,624
Grade 7 . . . . .	1,716	1,214	1,395	1,572
Grade 8 . . . . .	1,136	1,272	1,296	1,376
Grade 9 . . . . .	884	844	948	1,422
Grade 10 . . . . .	1,539	1,110	1,372	1,649
Grade 11 . . . . .	1,079	963	1,142	1,455
Grade 12 . . . . .	563	418	393	577
Non-Graded . . . . .		1,315	1,674	
TOTALS . . . . .	44,252	34,441	30,489	26,483

TABLE 6. TOTAL UNDUPLICATED TITLE I PARTICIPATION BY GRADE LEVELS FOR A FOUR-YEAR PERIOD

Grade Levels	Fiscal Year 1972	Fiscal Year 1973	Fiscal Year 1974	Fiscal Year 1975
Pre-Kindergarten . . . . .	6,276	6,839	7,300	6,364
Kindergarten . . . . .	5,944	5,134	5,182	6,705
Grade 1 . . . . .	20,043	19,364	19,386	20,170
Grade 2 . . . . .	24,792	24,427	24,360	24,804
Grade 3 . . . . .	21,409	20,962	21,087	21,211
Grade 4 . . . . .	15,428	14,699	14,333	17,815
Grade 5 . . . . .	11,710	10,605	10,489	12,739
Grade 6 . . . . .	9,256	7,924	7,951	9,009
Grade 7 . . . . .	5,585	4,478	3,825	3,508
Grade 8 . . . . .	3,110	2,568	2,183	2,616
Grade 9 . . . . .	2,072	1,273	1,177	1,665
Grade 10 . . . . .	2,196	1,351	1,434	1,677
Grade 11 . . . . .	2,179	1,092	1,162	1,469
Grade 12 . . . . .	920	472	399	609
Non-Graded . . . . .	2,008	2,152	2,361	-0-
TOTALS . . . . .	132,928	123,340	122,629	130,361

TABLE 7. STUDENT PARTICIPATION BY REGULAR AND SUMMER TERM MAJOR INSTRUCTIONAL AREAS

Major Instructional Areas	Regular Term Participants	Summer Term Participants
Reading . . . . .	101,369	21,672
Mathematics . . . . .	11,616	14,196
Vocational Education . . . . .	1,300	711
Tutorial Services . . . . .	6,112	2,660
Preschool Education . . . . .	7,958	1,741
Special Education . . . . .	635	1,203

TABLE 8. REPORTED STUDENT-TEACHER RATIOS AND NUMBERS OF STUDENTS A  
TEACHER MEETS EACH DAY FOR READING INSTRUCTION

Average Student- Teacher Ratios	Regular Term		Summer Term	
	Times Reported	Percent	Times Reported	Percent
1 to 1 . . . . .	3	6	3	5.0
2-6 to 1 . . . . .	518	93.3	30	49.2
7-12 to 1 . . . . .	23	4.1	21	35.6
More than 12 to 1 . . . . .	11	2.0	6	10.2

Number of Students a Teacher Meets Each Day	Regular Term		Summer Term	
	Times Reported	Percent	Times Reported	Percent
15 or less . . . . .	27	4.9	37	61.0
16-35 . . . . .	283	50.9	20	33.9
36-50 . . . . .	230	41.5	2	3.4
51-75 . . . . .	11	2.0	1	1.7
76-100 . . . . .	4	.7		

TABLE 9. PROFESSIONAL AND NON-PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL EMPLOYED IN TITLE I PROGRAMS

Personnel Categories	Regular Term		Summer Term	
	Full-time	Part-time	Full-time	Part-time
Teachers . . . . .	2,616	676	1,676	94
Guidance counselors . . . . .	6	15	26	1
Psychologists . . . . .	16	19	9	
Social workers . . . . .	37	5	4	
Speech therapists . . . . .	11	6	15	
Principals and Ass't. Principals . . . . .		13	110	4
Coordinators . . . . .	60	189	45	18
Supervisors . . . . .	14	32	27	3
Directors . . . . .	18	42	7	5
Teacher aides . . . . .	1,125	280	450	23
Tutors . . . . .	57	785	470	3
Other supportive personnel . . . . .	133	391	372	54
TOTALS*	4,093	2,453	3,211	205

\*Duplicated when employed in two or more major instructional areas.

TABLE 10. INSERVICE TRAINING FOR PROFESSIONAL AND NON-PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL INVOLVED IN TITLE I ACTIVITIES

Types of Inservice Training	Regular Term		Summer Term	
	Number of Persons	Number of Hours	Number of Persons	Number of Hours
Programs conducted by local administration . . . .	6,368	65,423	1,944	7,168
Conferences/workshops . . . . .	5,420	65,068	945	3,197
Coordinated teacher-teacher aide training programs . . .	2,635	34,481	398	1,025
Observations in other schools . . . . .	1,421	7,076	63	133
Miscellaneous, including county/state meetings, and reading workshops . . . .	1,093	9,331	364	1,403
Programs by university courses . . . . .	628	24,934	35	388
TOTALS . . . . .	17,565*	206,313	3,749*	13,314
Unduplicated numbers of staff members	7,680		2,819	

\*Duplicated to the extent that staff members were involved in more than one major instructional area and more than one type of inservice training.



TABLE 11. PROCEDURES USED BY LEAs TO INVOLVE NON-PUBLIC STUDENTS IN  
TITLE I ACTIVITIES

Types of Procedures	Times Reported
Written or telephone contact . . . . .	238
Personal contact with non-public schools . . . . .	215
Close cooperation exists; no need to stimulate involvement . . . . .	184
Non-public parents serving on Parent Advisory Council . . . . .	124
Non-public school personnel were actively involved in planning phases of this program . . . . .	106
Revised scheduling to facilitate non-public participation . . . . .	75
Liaison person hired or assigned by the public school . . . . .	63
Liaison person hired or assigned by the non-public school . . . . .	17
Miscellaneous, including transportation and contact with parents . . . . .	11

**TABLE 12. KINDS OF RESOURCES SHARED BY PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICTS WITH  
NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS**

Kinds of Resources	Times Reported
Title I personnel sent to non-public schools . . . . .	126
Non-public pupils participate in Title I activities in public schools . . . . .	52
Miscellaneous arrangements for sharing, including sharing of materials, equipment and facilities . . . . .	30
Public school pupils participate in Title I activities at non-public schools . . . . .	16

**TABLE 13. DIFFICULTIES ENCOUNTERED IN IMPLEMENTING PROJECTS WITH  
NON-PUBLIC SCHOOL STUDENTS**

Types of Difficulties	Times Reported
Scheduling . . . . .	78
Transportation . . . . .	51
Attendance areas . . . . .	47
Non-public refusal . . . . .	46
Different needs . . . . .	36
Geographical distance . . . . .	30
Communication . . . . .	28
Different type of organization . . . . .	27
Lack of space . . . . .	26

TABLE 14. FOUR-YEAR COMPARISON OF ESTIMATED NUMBER OF PARENTS INVOLVED IN TITLE I

Types of Involvement	Estimated Number of Parents			
	Fiscal Year 1972	Fiscal Year 1973	Fiscal Year 1974	Fiscal Year 1975
Individual conferences . . . .	53,991	59,012	58,820	73,252
Parental classroom visits . .	32,741	34,705	35,102	34,509
Group meetings for parents . .	36,517	29,876	28,122	33,012
Home visits . . . . .	27,241	24,467	27,418	26,342
Parents involved in the planning . . . . .	11,462	13,667	8,934	10,791
Parents serving on advisory committees . . . . .	6,343	6,168	6,353	6,486

TABLE 15. FOUR-YEAR COMPARISON OF ESTIMATED NUMBER OF HOURS SPENT BY PARENTS INVOLVED IN TITLE I

Types of Involvement	Estimated Number of Hours			
	Fiscal Year 1972	Fiscal Year 1973	Fiscal Year 1974	Fiscal Year 1975
Group meetings for parents . .	97,252	78,854	83,543	85,069
Parents involved in the planning . . . . .	40,592	48,506	29,566	46,048
Individual conferences . . . .	34,132	44,265	37,026	42,593
Parental classroom visits . .	32,533	39,826	47,280	34,018
Home visits . . . . .	24,851	23,755	21,873	23,924
Parents serving on advisory committees . . . . .	17,323	23,696	20,606	11,138

To define the terms concerning change, the following criteria were established as measured by standardized tests.

Marked Improvement

When a child gains 15.0 months or more in the course of a 10 month program, he is said to have made "marked improvement."

Improvement

When a child gains between 10.0 and 14.9 months in the course of a 10 month program he is said to have made "improvement."

Some Improvement

When a child gains between 5.0 and 9.9 months in the course of a 10 month program, he is said to have made "some improvement."

Little or No Improvement

If a child gains 4.9 months or less in the course of a 10 month program, he is said to have made "little or no improvement."

Since most Title I projects do not operate for exactly ten months, a conversion table was developed to assist the LEAs in computing the amount of pupil achievement gains in programs which operate for less than ten months.

TABLE 16. DEGREES OF ACHIEVEMENT CHANGE FOR READING AND MATHEMATICS IN REGULAR TERM AS MEASURED BY STANDARDIZED TESTS

Grade Ranges	Degrees of Change	REGULAR TERM			
		Reading		Mathematics	
		Times Reported	Percent	Times Reported	Percent
PreK-Kdg.	Marked Improvement . . . . .	2,794	51.8	948	54.2
	Improvement . . . . .	949	17.6	293	16.8
	Some Improvement . . . . .	1,048	19.4	325	18.6
	Little or No Improvement . . .	602	11.2	181	10.4
1 - 3	Marked Improvement . . . . .	21,796	39.4	913	56.0
	Improvement . . . . .	13,588	24.5	343	21.1
	Some Improvement . . . . .	12,099	21.8	227	14.0
	Little or No Improvement . . .	7,932	14.3	144	8.9
4 - 6	Marked Improvement . . . . .	10,178	42.5	2,400	59.8
	Improvement . . . . .	4,580	19.2	655	16.3
	Some Improvement . . . . .	4,242	17.8	468	11.6
	Little or No Improvement . . .	4,885	20.5	495	12.3
7 - 9	Marked Improvement . . . . .	1,294	43.0	254	59.3
	Improvement . . . . .	511	16.9	61	14.3
	Some Improvement . . . . .	583	19.3	42	9.8
	Little or No Improvement . . .	629	20.8	71	16.6
10 - 12	Marked Improvement . . . . .	36	31.6	11	28.2
	Improvement . . . . .	18	15.8	10	25.6
	Some Improvement . . . . .	25	21.9	15	38.5
	Little or No Improvement . . .	35	30.7	3	7.7

TABLE 17. DEGREES OF ACHIEVEMENT CHANGE FOR READING AND MATHEMATICS IN SUMMER TERM AS MEASURED BY STANDARDIZED TESTS

Grade Ranges	Degrees of Change	SUMMER TERM			
		Reading		Mathematics	
		Times Reported	Percent	Times Reported	Percent
PreK-Kdg.	Marked Improvement . . . . .	171	29.0	3	30.0
	Improvement . . . . .	119	20.2	4	40.0
	Some Improvement . . . . .	131	22.2	3	30.0
	Little or No Improvement . . . . .	168	28.6	0	0
1 - 3	Marked Improvement . . . . .	2,060	35.7	460	48.0
	Improvement . . . . .	1,223	21.2	113	11.8
	Some Improvement . . . . .	1,157	20.0	174	18.1
	Little or No Improvement . . . . .	1,332	23.1	212	22.1
4 - 6	Marked Improvement . . . . .	1,274	44.2	563	53.0
	Improvement . . . . .	393	13.6	123	11.6
	Some Improvement . . . . .	477	16.5	90	8.5
	Little or No Improvement . . . . .	743	25.7	286	26.9
7 - 9	Marked Improvement . . . . .	174	33.5	72	52.2
	Improvement . . . . .	50	9.7	6	4.3
	Some Improvement . . . . .	194	19.3	24	17.4
	Little or No Improvement . . . . .	100	37.5	36	26.1
10 - 12	Marked Improvement . . . . .	74	62.7	60	76.9
	Improvement . . . . .	1	.9	0	0
	Some Improvement . . . . .	30	25.4	4	5.1
	Little or No Improvement . . . . .	13	11.0	14	18.0

TABLE 18. DEGREES OF ACHIEVEMENT CHANGE FOR ALL REGULAR AND SUMMER TERM  
READING AND MATHEMATICS AS MEASURED BY STANDARDIZED TESTS

Degrees of Change	REGULAR TERM			
	Reading		Mathematics	
	Times Reported	Percent	Times Reported	Percent
Marked Improvement . . . . .	36,098	41.1	4,526	57.6
Improvement . . . . .	19,646	22.4	1,362	17.3
Some Improvement . . . . .	17,997	20.5	1,077	13.7
Little or No Improvement . . . .	14,083	16.0	894	11.4

Degrees of Change	SUMMER TERM			
	Reading		Mathematics	
	Times Reported	Percent	Times Reported	Percent
Marked Improvement . . . . .	3,753	37.9	1,158	51.6
Improvement . . . . .	1,786	18.1	246	10.9
Some Improvement . . . . .	1,989	20.1	295	13.1
Little or No Improvement . . . .	2,356	23.9	548	24.4

TABLE 19. EXPENDITURES OF FUNDS, NUMBERS OF PARTICIPANTS, AVERAGE DAILY MEMBERSHIP, AND PER-PUPIL EXPENDITURES

Reported Expenditures of Title I Funds

Regular term activities (fiscal year 1975 funds) . . . . .	\$34,386,302
Summer term activities (fiscal year 1975 funds) . . . . .	2,939,890
Regular term activities (fiscal year 1974 carry-over) . . . . .	13,411,643
Regular term activities (fiscal year 1974 Part C carry-over) . . . . .	1,302,319
Regular term activities (fiscal year 1973 carry-over) . . . . .	2,491,343
Total expenditures during fiscal year 1975 . . . . .	\$54,531,497

Number Participating in Title I

Regular term participants . . . . .	120,030
Summer term participants . . . . .	26,483
Participants in both regular and summer terms . . . . .	16,152

Average Daily Membership

Regular term participants . . . . .	107,341
Summer term participants . . . . .	23,987

Per Pupil Expenditure, Based on Numbers of Participants

Average per participant, regular term activities only . . . . .	\$430
Average per participant, summer term activities only . . . . .	\$111
Average per participant, if served in both regular and summer term activities . . . . .	\$541

Per Pupil Expenditure, Based on Average Daily Membership

Average per ADM, regular term activities only . . . . .	\$481
Average per ADM, summer term activities only . . . . .	\$123
Average per ADM, if served in both regular and summer term activities . . . . .	\$604



TABLE 20. REPORTED EXPENDITURES IN MAJOR INSTRUCTIONAL AREAS FOR  
REGULAR AND SUMMER TERMS

Major Instructional Areas	Regular Term	Summer Term	Total
Reading . . . . .	\$39,985,205	\$1,555,300	\$41,540,505
Mathematics . . . . .	3,933,892	769,863	4,703,755
Vocational Education . . . . .	131,010	46,124	177,134
Tutorial Services . . . . .	1,350,255	303,722	1,653,977
Preschool Education . . . . .	5,470,471	155,437	5,625,908
Special Education . . . . .	720,774	109,444	830,218
TOTALS . . . . .	\$51,591,607	\$2,939,890	\$54,531,497

TABLE 21. STATE, LOCAL, AND NON-TITLE I FEDERAL FUNDS USED TO SUPPORT  
TITLE I PROGRAMS

Types of Support	Reported Amounts
State funds provided for compensatory educational programs . . . . .	\$33,301,508
Local funds used to support Title I programs . . . . .	1,765,644
Follow Through federal funds . . . . .	689,842
Non-Title I federal funds used to support Title I programs . . . . .	197,354
TOTALS . . . . .	\$35,954,348

TABLE 22. TYPES OF PROGRAMS OFFERED BY THE STATE OF OHIO COMPENSATORY  
EDUCATION PROGRAM

Types of Programs	Number of Programs	Pupils Served	Estimated Expenditures
Academic achievement and remedial programs . . . . .	281	413,687	\$12,466,306
Adaptation of curriculum, instructional methods and materials . . . . .	107	329,261	8,316,405
Cultural enrichment experiences. .	37	90,760	826,752
Drop-out prevention . . . . .	43	30,141	1,865,575
Home-school and adult education . . . . .	29	54,028	1,435,029
Improvement of communication skills . . . . .	33	64,798	906,900
Improvement of health and related services . . . . .	98	154,103	2,320,234
Improvement of library services. .	95	165,464	2,439,930
Motivational and self-imagery development . . . . .	64	78,828	2,475,066
Safety and building security . . .	5	75,895	249,311
TOTALS . . . . .	791	1,456,965	\$33,301,508

TABLE 23. FOUR-YEAR COMPARISON OF THE STATE OF OHIO COMPENSATORY EDUCATION PROGRAM

Disadvantaged Pupil Program	Fiscal Year 1972	Fiscal Year 1973	Fiscal Year 1974	Fiscal Year 1975
Eligible school districts . . . . .	259	326	384	403
Participating school districts. .	255	322	382	402
Total number of programs . . . . .	636	736	785	791
Total number of students used for allocation . . . . .	166,935	214,346	234,517	240,163
Allocation per eligible pupil . .	\$200.00	\$155.00	\$142.00	\$139.00
Total number of pupils enrolled in program . . . . .	1,412,991	1,492,744	1,385,184	1,456,965
Total allocation . .	\$28,669,528	\$33,223,630	\$33,301,414	\$33,301,508

TABLE 24. SUMMARY OF FISCAL YEAR 1975 STATE EDUCATIONAL AGENCY ACTIVITIES

Approved:

Applications . . . . .	599
Revised budgets . . . . .	701
Carry-over budgets . . . . .	495
Revised carry-over budgets . . . . .	38
Part "C" applications . . . . .	48
Revised Part "C" applications . . . . .	10

Field Service Activities:

Program reviews . . . . .	375
Days in field . . . . .	458
Meetings (days in attendance) . . . . .	190
Office conferences . . . . .	449

Other significant activities:

Organized and conducted the State Title I Conference for more than 500 participants.

Participated in the Title I Educational Fair at Cleveland and Elyria.

Made available the multi-media presentation "Title I - It's Working." As of July 1, 1975, the presentation has been shown 30 times.

## SUCCESS STORIES

### STUDENTS' REACTIONS

"I would like to read better so my Dad can be proud of me."

"My mother wants me to bring the next book. She really like this one."

"My father thought the 'Wizard' book was fun. He thinks I should bring a harder book this time."

"It's fun. It helps us to learn stuff. I want to come back and work next year."

"I wish I could stay with you...I think the Title I room is O. K... I really do like everything...I love you."

"I like Title I because when I came down the steps I knew that I could learn that I could read better and have fun."

"I like the way they help me. I like the books that they let us read and take home. All three ladies helped us learn. They could help anybody."

"I don't like it. I love it."

"I feel glad."

"When I was in my other school I couldn't read and all the other kids were."

"We read a story today and I missed only one word."

\* \* \* \* \*

### TEACHERS' STATEMENTS

"A sixth grader haughtily told me, 'I haven't read a book in four years.' It wasn't long until he was thumbing through the paperbacks, then checking them out and then asking if he could take two at a time."

"I feel Title I is an important factor in the child's success and attitudes. The child with learning problems needs that extra attention, direction and reinforcement."

## TEACHERS' STATEMENTS (Continued)

"A youngster, one of 11, who comes from a very emotionally and materially deprived home, was my greatest joy and success this year. He was far behind in reading and background experiences. He was very withdrawn and would not communicate. He has come from sharing nothing to a sharing of interest and ideas. He was a king in a play, has given announcements over the public address system and has begun to respond in group situations."

"This year \_\_\_\_\_ signed up for a tutoring program and goes into an elementary school daily to help students on a one-to-one basis with reading. When \_\_\_\_\_ was asked why he signed up for the program, he said, "I know how much your reading program helped me, so I wanted to help someone else who was having trouble with reading."

\* \* \* \* \*

## PARENTS' COMMENTS

"I think Title I is the best thing that could happen to our school."

"\_\_\_\_\_ has made such a big improvement in his reading. I do appreciate the help you have given him. He enjoys reading very much and sets goals for himself. He seems very proud. Thank you."

"I think this program is a blessing to those who have trouble reading. It truly has meant a lot to this family as our child has improved in reading since being in Remedial Reading classes."

"It's a wonderful program. Keep it!!!"

"I think it should have been started a long time ago. I wish I had had this while I was in school."

"He was ashamed at first because he felt he was dumb and his father and I spoke to him and explained to him he wasn't dumb and this would be good for him. After one week in special reading class he was telling everyday how well he liked it and how glad he was to be in it."

"The special reading class was the most important class my daughter attended this year."

"He seemed to have more confidence in at least making an attempt at reading. Before he didn't even want to try."

"I sincerely appreciate this program. \_\_\_\_\_ will benefit from it the rest of her life. It has made the difference in her whole feeling for school."