DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 134 657 UD 016 715

TITLE Annual Evaluation Title I-ESEA Programs; Part 1 [Report], Part 2 [Analysis].
INSTITUTION Pennsylvania State Dept. of Education, Harrisburg. Bureau of Planning and Evaluation.
PUB DATE Aug 75
NOTE 89p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$4.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Elementary Secondary Education; *Federal Programs; Mathematics; *Program Descriptions; *Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; Reading Programs
IDENTIFIERS *Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I; ESEA Title I; *Pennsylvania

ABSTRACT

A description and an evaluation of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act Title I-funded programs for the state of Pennsylvania are contained in this document. It is in two parts. Part I is the evaluation report and presents data on participants and on activities and services. Part II is the analysis of the evaluation report. Results are presented for all of the school districts together and for Philadelphia and Pittsburgh separately. Data for all the school districts taken together indicated that project participants were generally making statistically significant improvement in reading and mathematics. Performance on both reading and mathematics tests in Philadelphia indicated mixed performance with some grades performing outstandingly, others poorly. For Pittsburgh, the reading performance of students indicated that students were doing as well as expected and in many cases much better than expected. Impressive results were obtained on students in the Reading Clinic in Pittsburgh on the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test. (Author/AM)

PART I
ANNUAL EVALUATION
TITLE I - ESEA PROGRAMS

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
HARRISBURG 17126

August, 1975

DIVISION OF COMPENSATORY PROGRAMS
BUREAU OF SPECIAL AND COMPENSATORY EDUCATION

INDEX

(PART I)

(PART II)

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
ANNUAL EVALUATION FOR FISCAL 1975
ESEA TITLE I

FOREWORD

This report encompasses information pertaining to Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (Public Law 89-10 as amended) as related to local educational agency (LEA) invlovement in activities and services conducted under the Act. Other Title I programs such as those administered for children of migratory farm workers, neglected and delinquent children in state institutions, and handicapped children in state institutions are covered in separate reports.

Any questions should be referred to the Chief, Division of Compensatory Programs, Bureau of Special and Compensatory Education, Pennsylvania Department of Education, Box 911, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, 17126. The telephone number is: (717) 787-7135.

SECTION I

The State Educational Agency (SEA)

1. Organization and Administration: The Secretary of Education has delegated the overall responsibility for administration of ESEA Title I in Pennsylvania to the Commissioner of Basic Education. Primary and secondary responsibilities have been further delegated to bureaus and divisions within the PDE as follows:

   Bureau of Special and Compensatory Education
   Telephone: (717) 783-1264

   Responsible for the overall direction of the:

   Division of Compensatory Programs
   Telephone: (717) 787-7135

   Responsible for the direct administration of the overall program, including program planning, development, approvals, operations and evaluations. Support is provided by the:

   Bureau of Information Systems, Division of Educational Statistics
   Telephone: (717) 787-2644

   Responsible for determining the locale of low-income children so county grants can be allocated as determined by the U.S. Office of Education (USOE).

   Bureau of Planning and Evaluation, Division of Field Surveys
   Telephone: (717) 787-7372

   Responsible for providing on-site evaluations and a report of each.

   Office of the Comptroller
   Telephone: (717) 783-1962

   Responsible for disbursement of funds; monitoring expenditures.

2. SEA Responsibilities: Throughout Title I regulations and other federal publications dealing with the program, constant reference is made to SEA responsibilities. The Division of Compensatory Programs has been directed to assume these responsibilities:

   a. Dissemination of all information needed to plan, develop, operate and evaluate a program.

   b. Allocating the basic state Title I grant among local school districts.

c. Reviewing, approving or rejecting applications on the basis of their compliance with Title I regulations.

d. Making on-site monitoring visits and scheduling PDE evaluations during the operation of a program.

e. Insuring cessation of any illegal activities or services financed by Title I funds when such situations become apparent.

f. Investigating and resolving complaints about Title I activities or services.

g. Reallocating unused funds.

h. Requiring each LEA to provide a self-evaluation of its program.

i. Providing for the carry-over of unused funds from one fiscal year to the next.

j. Providing program information to the USOE, other public agencies, interested groups and individuals.

3. SEA Procedures:

a. New developments in Title I are anhually presented by the SEA at the statewide conference of the Pennsylvania Association of Federal Program Coordinators. Workshops are also conducted in such areas as needs assessment, writing of behavioral objectives, application procedures, fiscal management, etc. The conference is usually held in April or May and is considered to be of great value to both new and experienced Title I personnel.

b. A written announcement of LEA allocations is made as early as possible. Usually, such allocations are for a tentative amount and are based upon the best information available at the time. This means the final allocation might be a lesser amount. Therefore, program planning by the LEA must be flexible enough to insure that activities can be curtailed with minimum effect on the educationally disadvantaged children who are in the greatest need of Title I services.

c. The announcement of allocations include a package of forms, special information and other materials necessary to complete a program.

d. Applications, when received, are date-stamped, and an acknowledgement is forwarded to the LEA within a few days. The acknowledgement indicates the date received and a fiscal year control number. The date of receipt is normally the date of project approval, although the SEA reserves the right to adjust this date in cases where the application is substantially incomplete.

e. An application is given a preliminary review and forwarded to a regional reviewer, who reviews it for accuracy and compliance with regulations and guidelines. The reviewer will contact the LEA by telephone or letter, or make a visit, to assist in resolving any problems that might preclude approval of the program.

f. The program is then reviewed by the Division Chief, who may require additional adjustments or more information. The review procedure will normally take two weeks. If no further action is required, the program is approved. An official PDE approval is forwarded to the LEA and the Comptroller. In some cases, approval may be conditional, with payment of funds delayed until the condition is met.

g. It is the SEA policy that all program operations be either monitored or evaluated annually. The on-site evaluations, conducted by the Division of Field Surveys, will usually be scheduled for each LEA at least once every three years. However, a district may request to be evaluated at any time.

h. At any time during the course of a program, if it becomes apparent to the SEA that an LEA is conducting activities or services that do not comform to the law, the SEA will advise the LEA to cease operation of the program, or a portion thereof. Failure on the part of the LEA to comply could result in an audit exeeption, or additional audit exceptions.

i. The SEA will investigate specific complaints from any source concerning a Title I program and will keep the LEA fully informed of the developments and any action to be taken, in the event that the complaint is deemed justified.

j. The SEA will reallocate any available unused funds to those districts having the greatest need for additional funds.

k. The SEA Will furnish the LEA standard forms for a self-evaluation of the last program conducted. Instructions will be provided with the forms.

l. The SEA will furnish, before August 31 of each year, the forms and instructions concerning the carry-over of any unused funds to the next school year, when such carry-over is authorized by law.

SECTION II

History of Funding

1. Part A -- (LEA - Low Income)

1966	$ 55,941,428
1967	45,384,315
1968	46,694,063
1969	42,963,616
1970	52,600,158
1971	60,724,183
1972	67,113,702
1973	72,723,125
1974	69,645,082
1975	78,521,519
TOTAL	$592,311,191

2. Part B -- (LEA - Special Incentive)

1974	$ 630,042
1975	1,359,037
TOTAL	$1,989,079

3. Part C -- (LEA - Special for Urban and Rural Districts)

1971	$ 548,680
1972	1,055,355
1973	2,680,406
1974	2,244,892
1975	2,326,597
TOTAL	$8,855,930

(Further Part C funding will not be authorized after this year in accordance with P.L. 93-380)

GRAND TOTAL OF ALL LEA GRANTS - $603,156,200

SECTION III

History of Formula Children

1. Formula Children in Relation to Allocations

The amount of ESEA Title I funds, which is appropriated annually by Congress, is allocated to the state and local school districts on the basis of certain formula children, aged 5 to 17 inclusive. Congress prescribes the various categories of such children. Basically, they have been and still are:

- (Low Income) - Children from families with an annual income under a specified amount, as counted in the U.S. decennial census.
- (AFDC) - Children from families receiving payments for aid to dependent children over a specified annual amount, as counted by the State Department of Welfare each January.
- (Foster) - Children living in foster homes and supported by public funds, as counted by the State Department of Welfare each January.
- (Institutionalized) - Children living in certain local institutions for neglected or delinquent children, as counted and certified by a local institution official for the month of January each year.

2. History of Formula Children from 1966 to 1973

Except for including foster children in 1967 and institutionalized children in 1968, the categories of formula children remained as follows throughout the period:

- Low Income (Effective 1966)

  Based on annual income of less than $2,000 - 1960 census.

- AFDC (Effective 1966)

  Based on annual income of over $2,000 - each January.

- Foster (Effective 1967)

  Based on number of children supported with public funds - each January.

- Institutionalized (Effective 1968)

  Based on average case load data - each January

In Pennsylvania, the number of children in each category for 1966 and 1973 was as follows:

Category	1966	1973
Low Income (1960 census)	175,394	175,394
AFDC	114,585	246,097
Foster & Institutionalized	0	16,253
TOTAL	289,979	437,744

3. Change of Formula in 1974

In 1974, the various categories of children remained the same - but "Low Income" was based on 1970 census data instead of 1960 data. As a result, figures for Pennsylvania, in comparison with the 1973 count, changed as follows:

Category	1973	1974
Low Income	175,394	102,040
AFDC	246,097	252,975
Foster & Institutionalized	16,253	15,792
TOTAL	437,744	370,807

The nation-wide impact, as the result of using the 1970 census data for the first time, was a sharp reduction in numbers of the "Low Income" children. The effect was so drastic in many school districts that Congress was prompted to amend the law to guarantee that each district, regardless of the number of formula children it could claim in 1974, would receive no less than 90 percent of the amount it received the previous year (1973), excluding any of the so called "impounded funds" for that year.

4. Change of Formula in 1975

Public Law 93-380, which went into effect for school year 1974-75, radically changed the method for counting certain formula children. The method, based on the so called "Orshansky Index", provided for the following categories:

- (Low Income) - Children from families with an annual income of LESS THAN $4,[redacted]00, as counted in the 1970 U.S. census.

- (AFDC) - Children from families receiving payments for aid to families with dependent children of $4,250.00 or more, TIMES .666 - OR TWO THIRDS OF THE TOTAL identified, as counted by the State Department of Welfare in January of 1974.

- (Foster) - Children living in foster homes and supported by public funds, as counted by the State Department of Welfare in January of 1974.

- (Institutionalized) - Children living in certain local institutions for neglected or delinquent children, as counted and certified by a local institution official for the month of January, 1974.

5. Impact of 1975 Formula Change

It should be noted that the following two factors produced quite an impact on Title I programs this year:

(1) Increasing the annual "Low Income" child limit from under $2,000 to under $4,250.

(2) Counting only 2/3 of AFDC children from families with incomes of $4,250 or more instead of all AFDC children from families with incomes of $2,000 or more.

The overall effect on Pennsylvania, as compared with the preceding year was as follows:

Category	1974	1975
Low Income	102,040	304,815
AFDC	252,975	47,630
Foster & Institutionalized	15,792	15,519
TOTAL	370,807	367,964

The following are examples of how some individual districts were affected as a result of the change:

District	Total Number of Formula Children (Gain/Loss)		
	1974	1975	
Philadelphia	152,006	114,710	-37,296
Pittsburgh	29,760	25,196	- 4,564

Chester Upland	6,256	5,573	- 683
Harrisburg	6,054	4,953	- 1,101
Erie	4,764	3,868	- 896
Altoona	2,115	2,591	+ 476
Johnstown	1,896	2,043	+ 147
Scranton	2,443	2,673	+ 230
Wilkes-Barre	1,742	2,172	+ 430
Hazelton	905	1,523	+ 618
Littlestown	85	166	+ 81
Cocalico	99	241	+ 142
Nazareth	75	269	+ 194
Greenwood	74	142	+ 88
Hollidaysburg	364	628	+ 263

NOTE: Since the 1975 state allocation was 8.9 million dollars higher than the 1974 allocation, all districts losing formula children did not suffer a financial loss. As a matter of fact, only Philadelphia and Erie in the above listing experienced a loss; Erie losing approximately $6,000 and Philadelphia losing 2.8 million, which of course was shared along with the increased state allocation by other districts gaining formula children, or not suffering a loss of the magnitude experienced by Erie and Philadelphia.

6. A Three Year Comparison

Since the formula remained virtually unchanged from 1966 to 1973 (except for the addition of foster and institutionalized children in the earlier years) and since changes in 1974 and 1975 had a drastic impact upon many districts, the following comparisons are shown:

	Total Number of Formula Children		
	1973	1974	1975
Pennsylvania	437,744	370,807	367,964

Selected Districts	Total Number of Formula Chidlren 1973		1974	1975
Philadelphia	139,827	*	152,006	114,710
Lancaster City	2,986		2,755	2,481
Wilkes-Barre	3,456		1,742	2,172
Meyersdale	520		264	364
Connellsville	2,939		1,738	2,465
Forest County	183		132	151
Bristol Township	1,855		2,037	1,399
Wilkinsburg	764	*	1,294	978
Neshaminy	750	*	886	599
Southeast Delco	970	*	1,179	1,076
Bensalem	750	*	941	599

NOTE: In those districts where the 1974 figures are marked with an asterisk (*), please note that a reversal of the state-wide trend in losing formula children as a result of using 1970 census data occurred. This happened in 59 of 505 school districts for a total of 15,882 children, with Philadelphia accounting for 12,179 out of that total. The majority of gaining districts were either in the Allegheny-Butler county sector or in the southeastern portion of Pennsylvania (Berks, Bucks, Delaware, Montgomery and Philadelphia counties).

7. Categories of Formula Children -- 1966 to 1975

Year	Low Income	AFDC	Other	Total
1966	175,394	114,585	0	289,979
1967	175,394	64,066	8,743	248,203
1968	175,394	80,878	16,967	273,239
1969	175,394	97,515	16,977	289,886
1970	175,394	131,044	15,113	321,551
1971	175,394	172,571	15,218	363,183
1972	175,394	223,345	15,715	414,454
1973	175,394	246,097	16,253	437,744
1974	102,040	252,975	15,792	370,807
1975	304,815	47,630	15,519	367,964

Section IV

Educational Agencies - Part A

1. Local (LEA)

Number in Commonwealth	505
Number Eligible for Title I	505
Number Participating in Title I	497

Non Participating Agencies:

(Name)	(County)	(Allocation)
Bellefonte	Centre	60,700
Bryn Athyn	Montgomery	2,130
Franklin Regional	Westmoreland	27,901
Penn Delco	Delaware	69,432
Steel Valley	Allegheny	130,771
Upper St. Clair	Allegheny	26,836
York Suburban	York	27,901
Yough	Westmoreland	77,583
	TOTAL	423,254

2. Intermediate (IU)

(IU)	(Number of LEAs Served)
Midwestern (#4)	14
Northwest Tri County (#5)	12
Seneca Highlands (#9)	9
Berks County (#14)	9
Northeastern (#19)	7
TOTAL	51

Section V

Programs

Total Regular Only	182
Total Summer Only	36
Total Regular and Summer	230
Total Number Received	448
Total Number Approved	446
Number Cooperative Programs	8 (Included above)

Cooperative Program Participants:

(Agent)		(LEA)	(County)	(Allocation)
IU #4	1.	Grove City	Mercer	129,706
	2.	Hickory Twp.	Mercer	18,955
	3.	Karns City	Butler	30,882
	4.	Lakeview	Mercer	70,284
	5.	Laurel	Lawrence	30,030
	6.	Mercer	Mercer	48,560
	7.	Mohawk	Lawrence	31,521
	8.	Moniteau	Butler	42,824
	9.	Neshannock	Lawrence	13,418
	10.	Reynolds	Mercer	49,838
	11.	Shenango	Lawrence	66,237
	12.	Slippery Rock	Butler	35,781
	13.	Union	Lawrence	40,680
	14.	Wilmington	Lawrence	60,487
			TOTAL	669,203
IU #5	1.	Crawford Central	Crawford	192,323
	2.	Penncrest	Crawford	142,911
	3.	Conneaut	Crawford	107,343
	4.	Titusville	Venango	141,846
	5.	Corry	Erie	116,288
	6.	Iroquois	Erie	25,984
	7.	Ft. LeBoeuf	Erie	56,227
	8.	Gen. McClane	Erie	51,968
	9.	Girard	Erie	28,753
	10.	Fairview	Erie	11,700
	11.	Union City	Erie	47,921
	12.	Wattsburg	Erie	41,106
			TOTAL	964,370

IU #9	1.	Austin	Potter	9,428
	2.	Cameron Co.	Cameron	47,921
	3.	Coudersport	Potter	31,521
	4.	Galeton	Potter	53,246
	5.	Johnsonburg	Elk	69,432
	6.	N. Potter	Potter	54,097
	7.	Oswayo Valley	Potter	32,160
	8.	Ridgway	Elk	57,931
	9.	Smethport	McKean	58,783
			TOTAL	414,429
IU #14	1.	Brandywine Hgts.	Berks	18,955
	2.	Daniel Boone	Berks	38,976
	3.	Fleetwood	Berks	20,446
	4.	Kutztown	Berks	51,542
	5.	Muhlenberg	Berks	19,168
	6.	Oley Valley	Berks	16,187
	7.	Schuylkill Valley	Berks	21,298
	8.	Twin Valley	Berks	75,396
	9.	Wyomissing	Berks	22,576
			TOTAL	284,544
IU #19	1.	Carbondale	Lackawanna	97,759
	2.	Dunmore	Lackawanna	74,331
	3.	Forest City	Susquehanna	23,21[illegible]
	4.	Lakeland	Lackawanna	60,700
	5.	Mid Valley	Lackawanna	55,375
	6.	North Pocono	Lackawanna	40,680
	7.	Valley View	Lackawanna	54,523
			TOTAL	406,583
Newport SD	1.	Newport	Perry	43,022
	2.	Greenwood	Perry	30,243
	3.	Susquenita	Perry	61,765
			TOTAL	135,030
Hatboro Horsham SD	1.	Hatboro Horsham	Montgomery	63,895
	2.	Lower Moreland	Montgomery	11,075
	3.	Upper Moreland	Montgomery	30,669
			TOTAL	105,639

Haverford SD	1. Haverford	Delaware	93,712
	2. Lower Merion	Montgomery	109,047
	3. Radnor Twp.	Delaware	52,394
		TOTAL	255,153

Recap of Cooperatives

Number of Programs	--	8
Number of LEA	--	60
Total Funding	--	3,234,951

Section VI

Participating Children Statistics - Part A Programs

Unduplicated Count of Children - Both Terms

From public schools	221,154
From non-public schools	30,054
TOTAL	251,208

Unduplicated Count of Children by Grade Level and Type School - Both Terms

(Level)	(Public)	(Private)	(Total)
Preschool	12,336	948	13,284
1-3	90,885	11,398	102,283
4-6	69,326	9,912	79,238
7-12	48,607	7,796	56,403
TOTALS	221,154	30,054	251,208

Analysis of Children by Grade Level and Type School - Both Terms

Percentage of Pre-School	5
Percentage of Early Elementary	41
Percentage of Later Elementary	32
Percentage of All Elementary	(73)
Percentage of Secondary	22
Percentage of Public School Children	88
Percentage of Private School Children	12

Unduplicated Count of Children - by Grade Level and Type School - Regular Term

(Level)	(Public)	(Private)	(Total)
Preschool	10,192	371	10,563
1-3	83,148	10,686	93,834
4-6	62,702	9,181	71,833
7-12	44,213	6,921	51,134
TOTALS	200,255	27,159	227,364

Analysis of Children by Grade Level and Type School - Regular Term

Percentage of Preschool	5
Percentage of Early Elementary	41
Percentage of Later Elementary	32
Percentage of All Elementary	(73)
Percentage of Secondary	22
Percentage of Public School Children	88
Percentage of Private School Children	12

Unduplicated Count of Children by Grade Level and Type School - Summer Term

(Level)	(Public)	(Private)	(Total)
Preschool	3,309	849	4,158
1-3	16,024	2,110	18,134
4-6	14,417	1,613	16,030
7-12	9,089	1,290	10,379
TOTALS	42,839	5,862	48,701

Analysis of Children by Grade Level and Type School - Summer Term

Percentage of Preschool	9
Percentage of Elementary School	37
Percentage of Later Elementary	33
Percentage of All Elementary	(70)
Percentage of Secondary	21
Percentage of Public School Children	88
Percentage of Private School Children	12

NOTE: The summer term includes children who may have also participated in the regular term. A separate breakdown of summer term children who did not participate in the regular term is shown below.

Unduplicated Count of Children by Grade Level and Type School - Summer Term - But Not Regular

(Level)	(Public)	(Private)	(Total)
Rreschool	2,144	577	2,721
1-3	7,737	712	8,449
4-6	6,613	731	7,344
7-12	4,455	875	5,330
TOTALS	20,949	2,895	23,844

Analysis of Children by Grade Level and Type School - Summer Term - But Not Regular

Percentage of Preschool	11
Percentage of Early Elementary	36
Percentage of Later Elementary	31
Percentage of All Elementary	67
Percentage of Secondary	22
Percentage of Public School Children	88
Percentage of Private School Children	12

Unduplicated Count of Children by Ethnic Group - Both Terms

White	141,157
Black	103,810
Hispanic American	5,615
American Indian	85
Other	541
TOTAL	251,208

Analysis of Children by Ethnic Group - Both Terms

Percentage of White	56.19
Percentage of Black	41.32
Percentage of Hispanic American	2.24
American Indian	0.03
Other	0.22

Comparison of Participating Children with Enrollments

(Public vs. Private)

	Participating	Enrolled	Percent Enrolled Participating
Public	221,154	2,277,080	9.7
Private	30,054	432,816	6.9
TOTALS	251,208	2,709,896	9.3

(Ethnic Groups)

	Participating	*Enrolled	Percent Enrolled Participating
White	141,157	2,348,157	6.0
Black	103,810	321,088	32.3
Hispanic American	5,615	31,446	17.9
American Indian	85	1,463	5.8
Other	541	7,742	7.0
TOTALS	251,208	2,709,896	9.3

*Ethnic enrollments for non-public schools are estimated on the basis of best national figures available; therefore a slight inaccuracy may exist.

(Grade Levels - Public Schools)

Level	Participating	Enrolled	Percent Enrolled Participating
Preschool	12,336	156,392	2.9
1-6	160,211	992,431	16.1
7-12	48,607	1,128,257	4.3
TOTALS	221,154	2,277,080	9.7

(Grade Levels - Private Schools)

Level	Participating	Enrolled	Percent Enrolled Participating
Preschool	948	13,674	6.9
1-6	21,310	224,074	9.5
7-12	7,796	195,068	4.0
TOTALS	30,054	432,816	6.9

Institutionalized Children

See Section VII

Handicapped Children

See Section VIII

Section VII

Children in Local Institutions - Part A Programs

Numbers of Formula Children

(Neglected)	(Delinquent)	(Total)
3824	1289	5113

Numbers of Institutions

(Neglected)	(Delinquent)	(Total)
73	11	84

Number of Districts Participating -- 54

Average Allocation per Formula Child -- $213.39

Average Expenditure per Participating Child -- $267.88

Unduplicated Count of Participating Children by Grade Level

(Preschool)	(Gr. 1-3)	(Gr. 4-6)	(Gr. 7-12)	(Total)
31	591	1102	2,349	4,073

Activities and Services (Projects) Funded - Institutionalized Children

The following are listed in rank order according to the largest number of children participating in either term.

Projects	Regular Term		Summer Term	
	No. of Children	No. of Projects	No. of Children	No. of Projects
Reading	1,489	31	1,253	25
Cultural Enrichment	554	12	451	13
Physi Ed./Rec.	139	4	508	10
Mathematics	357	11	415	12
Transportation	0	0	409	7
English - Other Lang. Arts	44	2	385	5
Curriculum Materials Center	374	2	308	2
Counseling	352	7	188	4
Art	336	4	296	5
Science - Social	4	1	226	5
Tutorial	224	1	84	3
Vocational Ed.	213	3	168	5
Library	0	0	200	1
Science - Natural	29	2	177	5
Perception Development	54	1	170	1
Special - Handicapped	150	5	136	4

Projects	Regular Term		Summer Term	
	No. of Children	No. of Projects	No. of Children	No. of Projects
Business Ed.	105	2	107	3
Music	60	1	98	4
Psychological	95	4	87	2
Social Work	81	3	0	0
Dental	58	2	0	0
Home Ec.	25	2	55	1
Medical	50	2	31	2
Camping	0	0	48	1
Home/School Visitor	47	1	00	0
Work Study	0	0	20	1
Foreign Language	20	1	0	0
Food	0	0	5	1
Psychiatric	0	0	2	1

Section VIII

Handicapped Children in Special Projects - Part A Programs

These are children who participated in projects specifically designed for them. They do not represent all handicapped children who may have participated in other projects. Amounts budgeted for projects are shown in Section IX.

Number of Projects

(Regular Term)	(Summer Term)	(Total)
15	17	32

Unduplicated Count of Children by Handicap

(Handicap)	(Number of Children)
Physical	450
Emotionally Disturbed	672
Trainable Mentally Retarded	455
Educable Mentally Retarded	185
Brain Injured	48
Visually Impaired	119
Hearing Impaired	1,365
Speech/Language Impaired	470
Total	3,764

Section IX

Activities and Services (Projects) - Part A Programs

Projects by Term - Ranked by Total Amount Budgeted

Rank	Project	Regular Term Children	Regular Term Budget	Summer Term Children	Summer Term Budget	Total Budget Both Terms
1	Reading	180,504	24,280,138	36,341	2,451,876	26,732,014
2	Preschool	10,444	5,592,730	3,549	632,845	6,225,574
3	Mathematics	108,557	3,758,985	19,701	952,690	4,711,675
4	Social Work	71,965	2,813,123	4,931	46,703	2,859,826
5	English - Other Lang. Arts	51,930	1,821,482	5,535	499,495	2,320,997
6	Counseling	29,388	1,547,306	7,764	134,240	1,681,546
7	English - 2nd Lang.	4,431	1,477,940	575	46,852	1,524,792
8	Transportation	12,733	260,205	23,165	521,835	782,040
9	Special Handicapped	2,921	431,803	2,112	251,473	683,276
10	Cultural Enrichment	9,422	377,028	5,582	280,294	657,322
11	Science - Natural	10,237	564,347	4,853	81,017	645,364
12	Science - Social	10,652	487,667	2,744	103,720	591,387
13	Tutorial Services	2,508	406,265	671	4,079	410,344
14	Psychological	5,234	275,543	1,915	26,610	302,153
15	Medical	6,215	184,689	8,420	55,173	239,682
16	Resource Centers	10,999	185,844	1,911	52,846	238,690

Rank	Project	Regular Term Children	Regular Term Budget	Summer Term Children	Summer Term Budget	Total Budget Both Terms
17	Physical Education	2,431	68,997	6,491	149,521	218,518
18	Transitional	1,002	186,703	12	12,030	198,733
19	Food	12,068	141,919	7,461	56,103	198,022
20	Attendance	2,922	122,030	1,478	75,824	197,854
21	Perception Development	706	174,567	467	13,885	188,452
22	Music	66,793	105,057	3,078	82,600	187,657
23	Home/School Visitor	3,255	169,052	426	1,360	170,412
24	Dental	8,064	137,855	2,647	18,362	156,217
25	Art	31,611	71,517	7,261	84,323	155,840
26	Vocational Education	669	105,378	1,433	43,522	148,900
27	Speech Therapy	5,975	97,865	174	6,962	104,827
28	Library Services	2,336	58,900	5,958	45,342	104,242
29	Camping	364	2,623	1,507	80,873	83,496
30	Business Education	378	35,095	442	12,778	47,873
31	Work Study	93	6,984	158	11,300	18,284
32	Home Economics	287	13,320	487	3,850	17,170
33	Community School	0	0	315	14,861	14,861
34	Special Education	0	0	72	9,325	9,325
35	Foreign Language	70	5,850	52	2,030	7,880
36	Psychiatric	85	5,600	2	100	5,700

Rank	Project	Regular Term Children	Regular Term Budget	Summer Term Children	Summer Term Budget	Total Budget Both Terms
37	Clothing	1,108	7,695	524	1,830	5,525
38	Educational TV	1,259	1,601	0	0	1,601
39	Continuing Education	30	560	0	0	560

Basic Skills - Percentage of Instructional and Supportive Costs Budgeted

(Skill)	* (Percentage)
Reading	51
Preschool	12
Mathematics	9
English - Other Language Arts	4
English - Second Language	3
Tutorial Services (Reading or Math	1
TOTAL	80

* Based on $52,848,631 (excludes costs for administration, inservice, operations/maintenance, fixed charges, indirect costs, costs for parents and capital outlay).

Five Leading Instructional Activities - Ranked by Number of Projects

	(Activity)	* (No. Projects - Regular)	*(No. Projects - Summer)
1	Reading	379	215
2	Mathematics	130	138
3	Pre School	64	48
4	Other Language Arts	42	39
5	Tutorial (Reading/Math)	28	7

Five Leading Supportive Services - Ranked by Number of Projects

	(Activity)	* (No. Projects - Regular)	* (No. Projects - Summer)
1.	Transportation	57	143
2.	Counseling	71	49
3.	Social Work	70	23
4.	Medical	43	48
5.	Dental	46	21

* Please note that totals do not represent numbers of districts, in that 60 districts participate in cooperative projects.

Amounts Budgeted per Child in Basic Skills

(Skill)	(Regular Term)	(Summer Term)
Reading	$134.51	$67.46
Preschool	535.50	60.59
Mathematics	34.62	48.[illegible]
English - Other Lang. Arts	35.07	90.24
English - Second Lang.	333.55	32.54
Tutorial Services -- (Reading or Math)	161.99	6.08

Amounts Budgeted per Child in the Leading Supportive Services

(Service)	(Regular Term)	(Summer Term)
Transportation	20.44	22.53
Counseling	52.65	17.29
Social Work	39.09	9.47
Medical	29.72	6.55
Dental	17.10	6.94

SECTION X

Fiscal - Part A Programs

Allocation

Tentative (Distributed 6-17-74)	$62,680,573
Final (Distributed 3-19-75)	78,521,519
Approved for Projects through 8-31-75	68,334,643
Approved for Projects after 8-31-75	9,763,622
Available for Reallocation	423,254

Carry-Over

* Included in Projects through 8-31-75	11,784,750
* Included in Projects after 8-31-75	9,763,622
* Total Carried Over (Includes Amt. for Realloc.)	21,548,372

* Subject to audit

Detailed Accounting for Funds

(Item)	(Amount)	(Percent of Total)
Instructional Activities	$44,292,326	56.4
Supportive Services	8,556,305	10.9
SUB TOTAL PROJECTS	(52,848,361)	(67.3)
Administration	1,804,188	2.3
Inservice	147,228	0.2
Operation/Maintenance	344,081	0.4
Fixed Charges	7,799,228	9.9
Capital Outlay	845,127	1.1
Indirect Costs	3,745,476	4.8
Parents	800,684	1.0
SUB TOTAL OVERALL PROGRAM COSTS	(15,486,012)	(19.7)

** Projects after 8-31-75 (Escrow)	9,763,622	12.4
Available for Reallocation	423,254	0.6
TOTAL ALLOCATION	78,521,519	100

** These funds were placed in escrow under salaries for carry over due to the late receipt of the final allocation from USOE (3-11-75)

Section XI

Selected Urban and Other District Profiles - Part A Programs

The following represents a profile of the ten largest districts in Pennsylvania in the terms of allocation, plus a selected 60 small districts which may be compared to a state profile. Also presented is a profile of the two largest districts in terms of allocation along with a comparison with the state profile.

Ten Largest Districts - in Terms of Allocation

(Name)	(Allocation)
Philadelphia	24,431,177
Pittsburgh	5,366,297
Chester Upland	1,186,949
Harrisburg	1,104,900
Erie	823,815
Reading	570,366
Scranton	569,301
Wilkes-Barre	462,597
Lancaster	528,409
York	448,966
TOTAL	35,492,777

60 Selected Districts

(Name)	(Allocation)
[redacted]FER TO LISTING OF COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS IN SECTION V OF THIS REPORT	INDIVIDUAL ALLOCATIONS ARE SHOWN IN SECTION V
TOTAL	3,234,951

Profile Comparisons - 70 Districts and State

(Item)	(10 Dist.)	(60 Dist.)	(State)
Percent - State Allocation	45%	4%	-----
Participating Children			
Total Number	130,915	8,488	251,208
Percent of Total	52.1%	3.4%	
Total Public	113,164	8,001	221,154
Percent of Public	86.4%	94.3%	88%
Total Non-Public	17,751	487	30,054
Percent of Non-Public	13.6%	5.8%	12%
Total White	34,937	8,181	141,157
Percent of White,	26.7%	96.4%	56.2%
Total Black	92,587	258	103,810
Percent of Black	70.7%	3.0%	41.3%
Total Hisp. American	3,329	38	5,615
Percent of Hisp. American	2.5%	0.5%	2.2%

Accounting for Funds - As Budgeted

(Category)	(10 Dist.)	(60 Dist.)	(State)
Projects			
Reading	28.4%	36.5%	34.2%
Preschool	15.3	2.5	7.9
Mathematics	6.5	8.8	6.0
Social Work	6.6	0.7	3.7
English - Other Lang. Arts	2.9	5.1	3.0
Counseling	2.5	0.5	2.2
English - Second Lang.	3.8	1.3	2.0
Transportation	0.3	2.1	1.0
Special Handicapped	1.0	1.5	0.9
Cultural Enrichment	0.9	0	0.8
Other	9.4	27.3	18.6

Overall Program Costs - Not Included in Preceding Category

Administration	3.1	0.3	2.3
Inservice	0.04	0.6	0.2
Operation/Maint.	0.4	0.6	0.4
Fixed Charges	11.2	8.7	10.0
Capital Outlay	0.8	3.0	1.0
Indirect Costs	5.5	0.4	4.8
Parents	1.3	0.1	1.0

Two Largest Districts - In Terms of Allocation

(Name)	(Allocation)
Philadelphia	24,431,177
Pittsburgh	5,366,297
TOTAL	29,797,474

Profile Comparisons - 2 Districts and State

(Item)	(Phila.)	(Pittsburgh)	(State)
Percent - State Allocation	31.1%	6.8%	-----
Participating Children			
Total Number	101,690	13,954	251,208
Percent of Total	40.5%	5.6%	-----
Total Public	88,771	11,598	221,154
Percent of Public	87.3%	83.1%	88%
Total Non-Public	12,919	2,356	30,054
Percent of Non-Public	12.7%	16.9%	12%
Total White	19,322	7,089	141,157
Percent of White	19.0%	50.8%	56.2%
Total Black	80,335	6,818	103,810
Percent of Black	79.9%	48.9%	41.3%
Total Hispanic American	2,033	18	5,615
Percent of Hispanic American	01.9%	0.1%	2.2%

Accounting for Funds - As Budgeted

(Category)	(Phila.)	(Pitts'b)	(State)
Projects			
Reading	30.3%	22.3%	34.2%
Preschool	20.8	1.7	7.9
Mathematics	5.8	4.9	6.0
Social Work	8.7	2.4	3.7
English - Other Lang. Arts	1.2	12.3	3.0
Counseling	0.001	5.3	2.2
English - 2nd Lang.	4.8	0	2.0
Transportation	0	0.5	1.0
Special Handicapped	0.01	0.3	0.9
Cultural Enrichment	0.4	2.8	0.8
Other	3.9	27.1	18.6
Overall Program Costs - Not Included Above			
Administration	4.4	0	2.3
Inservice	*0	*0	0.2
Operation/Maintenance	0.02	0.6	0.4
Fixed Charges	10.9	11.9	10.0
Capital Outlay	0.7	1.8	1.0
Indirect Costs	6.2	6.0	4.8
Parents	1.9	0.05	1.0

* Inservice projects were conducted, however costs are reflected only in contracted services and other expenses which were not charged to the budget by these districts.

Section XII

Part B Programs

In 1974-75, Pennsylvania became eligible for the second time for a grant under Part B, ESEA Title I. Since the grant was not received until June 11, 1975, all funds were carried over to fiscal year 1976 for programs to be conducted during the 1975-76 term. Eligibility for a grant was based on local tax effort expressed in terms of taxes as mills on market value and concentrations of low income children. Districts not meeting the school tax effort, but who had an above average municipal tax overburden were considered eligible, with 5 districts falling into this catogory. Specifically, this meant that the local school tax effort had to be greater than the state average of 27.1, or above the state average of 48.8 for the combined school and municipal tax effort. Based on Title I statistics, the percentage of low income children had to be above the state average of 13.8.

All eligible districts were invited to submit preliminary proposals in accordance with the criteria contained in the regulations and other information furnished by the U.S. Office of Education. All preliminary proposals were carefully screened and numerically scored by several bureaus. Scoring was based on the following:

1. Innovative nature.
2. Extent to which comprehensive assessment of needs demonstrated a need for a Part B program.
3. Extent to which the proposal responded to the needs.
4. Extent to which objectives defined the expectations of the program.
5. Extent to which objectives were expressed in measurable and/or performance terms.
6. Extent to which an overall evaluation could be made in terms of grade groupings or age groupings.

All districts were clearly advised that even though they might be eligible for a grant, there was no guarantee that their proposed program would be funded due to the relatively small amount of funds available. However, since only 72 percent of the eligible districts applied, it was possible to fund all the applicants in the maximum amount they proposed. The following statistics are furnished:

Eligible Districts and Programs Submitted

Number of eligible districts	25
Number of proposals received	19
Number of programs received	*18

*Chester Upland S.D. withdrew proposal for $76,452.00

Program and Budget Information:

(Activity/Service)	(No. Children)	(Amt. Budgeted)
English - Other Language Arts	480	327,000
Mathematics	3,474	314,072
Reading	3,312	255,974
Preschool	570	53,274
Tutorial	370	39,360
	Sub Total - Instructional	(986,680)
Psychological	450	20,360
Counseling	737	11,444
Transportation	570	3,650
Home/School Visitor	70	2,850
Medical	120	2,850
	Sub Total Supportive	(41,154)

Costs not included Above

Administration	9,600
Indirect Costs	30,684
Inservice	3,483
Operation/Maintenance	6,416
Fixed Charges	106,856
Capital Outlay	84,222
Costs for Parents	1,950
Sub Total Other Costs	(243,211)
Total Amount Budgeted	1,274,045
Available for Reallocation	84,992
Total Allocation	1,359,037

Selected Budget Categories Included Above

Salaries	799,837
Materials and Supplies	120,212

Concentration of Services

Unduplicated count of children served	7,203
Average amount budgeted per child	176.88

Section XIII

Part C Programs

Public Law 93-380 changed the method of distributing Part C funds. Instead of allocating on a statewide basis in 1974-75, the funds were distributed to counties with the highest concentrations of low income children. The U.S. Office of Education determined the following counties to be eligible and computed the allocations as indicated:

Allegheny County	559,417
Delaware County	144,750
Philadelphia County	1,622,430
Total	2,326,597

Since the grant was not received until March 10, 1975, the funds were in most cases not used until school year 1975-76, although a few districts did use part of them for a 1974-75 summer term program.

Practically all districts are using the funds for continuing or supplementing previously approved Part A projects in the area of the basic skills.

There were a total of 62 districts eligible for funds. To date, only 41 of these districts are expected to participate. The remaining funds will be reallocated within Allegheny and Delaware county.

Part C funding will be discontinued after this year in accordance with P.L. 93-380. Since funds were first made available in 1970-71, this program has not been popular with smaller districts. This was due to the relatively small amount of money, maintaining of additional sets of records and difficulty in evaluating the program apart from the Part A program which it often supplemented.

SECTION XIV

Compliance with Criteria

(See USOE Directive INST L203.1 - Formerly Program Guide #44)

While the laws governing ESEA Title I are complicated, the basic principles are contained in the publication cited above. This directive must be carefully perused by all persons charged with the responsibility for administering the program, or those wishing to gain a basic understanding of ESEA Title I. Copies are available without charge for any interested persons.

Attendance Areas

Eligible attendance areas are selected on the basis of the highest concentrations of low income children. In making this determination, school districts use a variety of data sources, but whatever data are used must be applied uniformly throughout the district. Most Pennsylvania districts find that the best data sources are AFDC records, free or reduced lunches, home/school visitor reports and parent questionnaires. In Pennsylvania, the various methods of target selection have been given an alphabetical designation and are as follows:

"A" - Percentage Method

"B" - Numerical Average Method

"C" - Combination Percentage/Average Method

"D" - No Wide Variance Method

In 1974-75, 3,332 attendance areas were declared eligible. This represents approximately 78 percent of the total number in the state. The number of districts using the prescribed target method were as follows:

153 - Percentage

1 - Combination Percentage/Average

343 - No Wide Variance

Although Public Law 93-380, August 21, 1974, makes some changes in the selection of eligible attendance areas, the 1974-75 program applications were solicited on June 17, 1974 and therefore the changes cannot be implemented until the 1975-76 program year. The most significant effect of the changes will be in the "no wide variance" method of selecting attendance areas, whereby eligibility will be based on a district-wide variance rather than a statewide variance in the incidence of low income children. The statewide variance has been established as 8 percentage points for the past several years and from 70 to 75 percent of the districts were able to declare all attendance areas

as eligible. Using the districtwide variance, will find many districts unable to use the no wide variance method. However, a so called "grandparent clause" in the law will enable districts to declare some attendance areas eligible in 1975-76 and 1976-77, even if they do not currently meet the required percentage/ average requirements. This means that in 1977-78 there will be a considerable lesser number of eligible attendance areas. It also means that a great many districts will face preparation of detailed comparability reports for the first time. Districts are being alerted to these ramifications.

Needs Assessment

As mentioned in the 1973-74 evaluation report, further measures were to be taken in 1974-75 to strengthen the needs assessment process. An official position paper was issued for 1974-75 and the narrative portion of the application amended to provide a standardized and more detailed documentation of the process. This was the greatest in depth effort made in the area of needs assessment since inception of the program. The application provides a detailed record in response to the following questions:

- How was the assessment done?
- When was it done?
- Who was involved?
- What priorities were established?

Although the SEA believes that an adequate needs assessment process is in effect, further refinements can be expected for 1975-76.

Pennsylvania takes no official position on the priority for particular groups of pupils, such as preschool, early elementary and secondary. The comprehensive assessment of needs, if properly conducted will bring Title I services to those children with the greatest needs.

The narrative portion of the Title I application requires that comprehensive planning sessions be well documented to show the involvement of non-public school authorities, parent council members, local institution representatives, staff consultants and representatives of community action and other agencies.

The address, phone number and other information must be shown for each parent council member. The district must describe the nature and extent of parental involvement in the planning, with specific requirements as to what unmet needs of pupils as suggested by parents are to be met in the program. Any unmet needs must be shown in order of priority. In addition to this documentation, the state requires that the parent council chairperson and non-public school authorities submit a statement indicating their involvement in the comprehensive planning phase of the program.

Special projects for handicapped children are approved only when assurances are received from the Division of Special Education that other funds are not available to meet the needs of these children.

Pennsylvania has a mandated bi-lingual program, therefore, English Second Language programs are approved, only if the applicant can demonstrate that any Title I project in this area is above and beyond the state program requirements.

Program Design

In 1974-75, Pennsylvania required that a minimum of $234 be spent on each Title I child. In previous years concentration of services was based on a specified percentage of the Title I formula children counted each year. This meant that 335,562 children could have been served in 1974-75, but many districts chose to effect a greater degree of concentration and only 251,208 children were served. Even though the total allocation was not expended, carryover funds from previous years (1972-73 and 1973-74) brought the per pupil expenditure to approximately $310.00 per child.

Special emphasis on the writing of performance objectives continued in 1974-75. A great measure of improvement was noted in this area. There were at least 60 percent fewer delayed or conditional approvals caused by deficiences in writing objectives, than in the preceding year.

No official position is taken on Title I summer services; Pennsylvania believing each district is better able to determine this. Of the 448 programs submitted, 266 (59%) included summer projects. The number of summer only programs decreased from 66 in the previous year to 36 in 1974-75. This was due to the Orshansky formula which found many of the smaller districts with increased funding and therefore better able to afford a regular term program.

Private school children in Pennsylvania continued to be afforded a meaningful opportunity to participate in Title I. In 1974-75, services were afforded to 30,054 such children. This represented 12 percent of the total participants. Non public school children represent approximately 16% of the State school population. Almost 7 percent of the enrolled non public children were involved in Title I. A number of private schools in Pennsylvania do not participate in Title I (Amish; some Mennonite, etc.). Considering this, it is believed that comparisons between public and non public school percentages (e.g. percentage of total participants and percentage of participants versus enrollees) would be most favorable. Detailed statistics are outlined in Section VI of this report.

Implementation of Programs

Staffing statistics are not presented in this evaluation. The SEA concentrates its efforts on the systematic collection of data in those areas in which it knows by experience to be of general and continuing interest to those agencies, organizations and individuals who request Title I information. Since statewide staffing information has not been among the areas of general interest, collection efforts are concentrated on other data. This does not mean staffing is ignored. Adequate staffing information appears in all applications and is carefully reviewed during the review process, where it becomes a meaningful facet of each individual program. 74 percent of the state allocation is budgeted for staff salaries.

Program applications contain a description of inservice training for Title I staff and special attention is given to joint training of aides and the professional staff members with whom they work.

Virtually all programs contain an inservice component consisting of several sessions during the year. Statewide statistics are not collected as to numbers of persons involved. Section X of this report notes that $147,228 was budgeted for inservice. This figure does not in any respect portray the scope of inservice training. The sum represents only contracted and other expenses devoted to inservice. Most inservice programs are conducted by locally paid Title I staff members with available materials; therefore these costs are not reflected in the overall inservice program.

Parents are becoming more and more involved in Title I. During 1974-75 the SEA conducted a series of 18 workshops throughout the state to train leaders and participants for parent councils for every Title I school in the state. There were 860 parents and 600 local administrators involved in this effort to give parents a better understanding of Title I and to promote an understanding of how school and local school officials can work together. It is estimated that almost 15,000 parents were engaged in council activities, and 5,000 in other Title I activities during the year. The increased involvement of parents mandated by P.L. 93-380 is commensurate with an overall Commonwealth policy of increasing the influence of parents, and citizens generally, in the operation of Pennsylvania schools.

The SEA closely monitors expenditures for equipment, materials and supplies. Unless a justification can be presented, equipment may not exceed 6 percent of the total program budget. Materials and supplies are limited to 10 percent. Most districts find no problems with these limitations and waivers are rarely requested. Statewide, 6 percent of total amount budgeted was for materials and supplies with slightly over 1 percent being budgeted for all capital outlay.

Construction with Title I funds is strongly discouraged and requires prior SEA approval before any amount is included in a proposed budget. No funds for constructions were authorized in 1974-75.

All applications require that the narrative portion contain plans for disseminating Title I information. Implementation of the plans are checked during on-site visits and formal evaluations. Press coverage appears to be very adequate in most cases. Internal staff dissemination is steadily improving due to the efforts of monitors and evaluators.

With increasing emphasis on parental involvement dissemination to parents has reached a much more satisfactory level than in earlier years. The SEA annually makes a major effort in dissemination at a 4-day conference sponsored by the Pennsylvania Association of Federal Coordinators. In addition, periodic regional workshops are being conducted at more frequent intervals by the program review staff.

Evaluation

During 1974-75, The SEA contracted with the Bureau of Research, West Chester State College, to analyze the pre and post test scores of Title I children in reading and mathematics. This was the most comprehensive data obtained to date by the SEA and it is planned to continue this effort with expectations that a greater number of districts will present data free of errors for proper analysis. The results of this effort are contained in Part II of this publication.

Approximately 65 percent of all program operations were either monitored or evaluated during the year. The formal on-site evaluations are conducted under the supervision of the Division of Field Surveys. A pool of approximately 800 persons is maintained to perform evaluations. This list of evaluators encompasses teachers, administrators and program directors in all subject areas of education at the elementary, secondary and higher education levels. Also, parents from community action agencies and/or advisory councils are used as evaluators.

A standard instrument is used by all evaluators to measure the effectiveness of the Title I program and to insure that the program is being evaluated in accordance with the law. During the year, 148 programs were evaluated at a cost of $76,650. All evaluation reports are scrutinized by the Chief, Division of Compensatory Programs, the Senior Programs Officer and the regional reviewer concerned. All reports are followed up by a letter or a series of letters and new programs are not approved until the previous evaluation report is reviewed and it can be determined that any deficiencies have been corrected.

The SEA is not completely satisfied with its efforts in respect to evaluation and monitoring. While there was a 10 percent increase in the number of programs monitored or evaluated, the goal of 100 percent still has not been realized. Although 2 additional regional reviewers were added to the 1974-75 staff, the increased paper work, involvement in regional workshops and training of the new staff members did not expand the scope of monitoring activities to the degree that was hoped for. A standard self evaluation instrument was developed and used for 1974-75. A review of the forms compensated somewhat for the deficiency in on-site monitoring and evaluation visits. In an effort to improve the competency of on-site evaluators, a series of workshops were conducted throughout the state in 1974-75 with 213 persons attending the sessions.

Supplementing versus Supplanting

All applicants are required to give an assurance that Title I funds will not be used to supplant state and local funds. The application review process includes an effort to detect any violations in this respect.

SECTION XV

Goals for 1975-76

Based on the overall evaluation of the 1974-75 program, the SEA has formulated plans for program improvement in the following areas by:

- Increasing the number of on-site monitoring visits during program operations.
- Continuing emphasis on the basic skills.
- Providing further training for on-site evaluators.
- Disseminating more information to parent councils.
- Developing better instruments for recording on-site evaluations and monitoring visits.
- Providing more educationally sound projects for institutionalized children.
- Improving program review techniques and establishing more precise standards for the review of self evaluation forms.
- Developing and implementing an electronic data collection system.

APPENDIX "A"

1974-1975

Secretary of Education	The Honorable John C. Pittenger
Commissioner of Basic Education	Donald M. Carroll (to be succeeded by by Frank Manchester in September 1975)
Director, Bureau of Special and Compensatory Education	Ferman B. Moody
Chief, Division of Compensatory Programs	William M. Dallam
Senior Programs Officer	John M. Hyams

Regional Reviewers

Clarence T. Berner
Jacqueline B. Brown
Joseph E. Dunn
Ray K. Hagenbuch
James A. Holmes
Karl E. Hope
Robent E. Martin
James M. Sheffer
Thomas Schurtz

This Evaluation Report prepared by:

Kenneth H. Schmelzlen,
Administrative Assistant

Nandira R. Williams
Data Collection Clerk
Clerk Typist

Patricia A. Gabriel
Data Collection Clerk

PART II
ANNUAL EVALUATION
TITLE I - ESEA PROGRAMS

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
HARRISBURG 17126

August, 1975

DIVISION OF COMPENSATORY PROGRAMS
BUREAU OF SPECIAL AND COMPENSATORY EDUCATION

ANALYSIS OF E.S.E.A. TITLE I TEST DATA SUBMITTED BY PENNSYLVANIA SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Submitted to: Mr. William Dallam, Chief
Division of Compensatory Programs
Bureau of Special and Compensatory Education
Department of Education
Box 911
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17126

Submitted by: Bureau of Research and Related Services
West Chester State College
West Chester, Pennsylvania 19380

March 12, 1976

Bureau of Research and Related Services
West Chester State College
West Chester, Pennsylvania 19380

I. Comments

The following report represents the Pennsylvania Department of Education's effort to gather and analyze evaluative data on a state-wide basis. The Title I programs throughout the Commonwealth have previously been evaluated using a variety of product and process criteria which have been difficult to combine in a coherent report. In order to effect a state-wide analysis, the Pennsylvania Department of Education entered into a contract with the Bureau of Research at West Chester State College. The Department of Education gathered and screened the available test results while West Chester State College processed and analyzed the data.

II. Procedures

In the spring of 1975 all school districts having Title I programs were asked to provide the pre- and posttest scores of participating students in reading and mathematics. No stipulations were made as to the dates for pre- and posttesting or the tests to be employed.

As a result, a very diverse group of tests with pre-post intervals of four months to two years was presented for analysis. The data from over 50 school districts could not be analyzed due to one or more of the following problems:

1) Scores reported in other than grade equivalent form. Percentiles and standard scores were employed.
2) Interval between pre- and posttests not stated.
3) Test used was not identified.
4) Posttesting with an instrument different than that used on the pretest.
5) Grade level of student not specified.

Three hundred and seventy-three (373) school districts submitted rosters which were free of these errors. In order to determine the impact of Title I programs statewide, the data from the standardized tests were analyzed to determine:

1) Is the increase in performance between pre-and posttests statistically significant? The "t" test between correlated means was employed at the .05 level of confidence (two tailed).

2) Is the increase in performance between pre- and posttests greater than the interval between tests? If eight months elapse between pre- and posttests, do the students gain eight months of content mastery? This is a very stringent procedure since these children typically show about seven months' increase in content mastery in a nine to ten-month school year.

3) Is the student's growth rate during the interval between pre- and posttests greater than would be expected on the basis of his past performance? A child enters the fourth grade with a reading pretest of 2.0. This means he has studied four years (K-1-2-3) to achieve two years of content mastery. His typical gain per school year, therefore, is .50 years or five months. Rapp and Haggart[1] suggest the following type formula for expected gain:

$$\text{Expected Gain} = \frac{\text{Entering Grade Equivalent Score}}{\text{Grade to Nearest Month}} \times \text{Interval Between Tests}$$

[1]Rapp, M. L. and Haggart, S. A. "Idiographic Analysis of Achievement Measures" Educational Technology, Vol. XIII, No. 5, May, 1973, pp. 23-26.

If the observed gain exceeds the expected gain, then the child's learning rate has accelerated during the time segment evaluated. Such acceleration is essential if these children are to move toward the national norms. This analysis (observed vs. expected gain) is appropriate at the middle and upper elementary grades but is considered too stringent at the earlier grades (one and two) because of non-establishment of typical past performance. It was, therefore, not employed at grades one and two. The individual school district reports did include this data for grades one and two for informational purposes. The unit for statistical analysis was the class. Class means by grade level were developed for the pretests and posttests on standardized tests. Class sizes with less than 10 were excluded from the analysis. Data, however, was run for informational purposes for the district.

III. Results

The results are presented in two sections. The first section presents the analysis of statewide reading and mathematics data submitted by school districts other than Philadelphia and Pittsburgh. The second section is the analysis of data from Philadelphia and Pittsburgh.

In each section the results are analyzed by the test employed. There were no dominant mathematics achievement tests utilized statewide, however, so analysis in Section I is for all mathematics achievement test data combined.

Reading-Statewide. Only school districts submitting pre-post data for at least ten students per grade level are included. The class was the unit for analysis. If a district supplied data for more than one class per grade each

class was treated as a separate entity and was utilized in the statistical analysis. For instance, if a district submitted data for six seventh grade classes, six class means were developed and were utilized in the statistical analysis. In order to obtain a picture of the impact of Title I programs statewide, the data was organized in tabular form to describe the percentage of classes in which the mean observed gain exceeded the interval between tests. This same procedure was then applied to determine the percentage of classes in which the observed gain was greater than the expected. This descriptive data is presented in Table I.

Table I indicates that school districts in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania were very successful in improving Title I participants' rate of learning in reading. The percentage of districts in which the observed gain exceeded the interval between tests ranged from 38.6% at the first grade level to 100% at the tenth grade level. Of the 2,319 statewide classes studied in this report, 1,262 or 54.4% had an observed mean gain greater than the interval between tests. The percentage of classes in which the observed mean gain from pre to post exceeded the expected mean gain ranged from 66.7% in the twelfth grade to 100% at the tenth grade level. Statewide, 1,418 of the 1,847 classes from grades three through twelve or 76.7% showed mean gains greater than expected.

Presented in Table II is the performance of Title I participants in districts which administer the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test. The vocabulary subtest scores are analyzed by grade level.

Reading vocabulary improvement was statistically significant at all nine levels. With the exception of grade seven, the observed gain was significantly higher than expected in every grade. The observed mean gain was greater than the mean interval between tests at five of the nine grade levels and was fairly close at the four grade levels.

Table I

Summary of Performance Comparisons By Grade Level
For 373 School Districts On All Reading Measures
(Philadelphia and Pittsburgh Not Included)

Grade	Number Of District Class Comparisons*	Number Observed Gain > Test Interval	%	Number Observed Gain > Expected Gain	%
1	70	27	38.6%	N/A	N/A
2	402	209	52.0%	N/A	N/A
3	433	239	55.2%	331	76.4%
4	432	203	47.0%	309	71.5%
5	369	202	54.7%	293	79.4%
6	266	158	59.4%	212	79.7%
7	158	100	63.3%	123	77.8%
8	134	76	56.7%	100	74.6%
9	39	34	87.2%	36	92.3%
10	8	8	100.0%	8	100.0%
11	5	4	80.0%	4	80.0%
12	3	2	66.7%	2	66.7%

*Number of school districts submitting pre-post data for at least ten students for comparison at this grade level. If a district submits data for more than one test at a particular grade level, it is counted twice.

Table II

1974-75 Performance of Pennsylvania* Title I Participants
On The Gates-MacGinitie Reading Vocabulary Test

Grade	Number of District Classes	Number of Children	Pre Mean	Post Mean	Observed Gain	"t" Pre-Post	Interval Between Tests	Expected Gain***	"t" Observed vs. Expected Gain
1	10	161	1.51	2.10	.59	11.99**	.55	.67	N/A
2	53	1,747	1.65	2.57	.92	21.30**	.77	.62	N/A
3	58	1,874	2.14	3.11	.97	18.16**	.76	.53	7.66**
4	55	1,649	3.17	3.88	.71	13.73**	.77	.61	2.08**
5	44	1,204	3.68	4.43	.75	18.89**	.78	.58	4.56**
6	31	793	4.28	5.04	.76	10.64**	.79	.56	2.46**
7	17	434	5.00	5.64	.64	6.14**	.73	.51	1.28 NS
8	13	344	5.47	6.34	.87	6.61**	.75	.51	2.97**
9	4	135	6.30	7.94	1.64	5.84**	.85	.60	3.54**

8341

*Excluding Philadelphia and Pittsburgh
**Significant at .05 level; degrees of freedom based on number of district classes

***Expected Gain = $\frac{\text{Entering Grade Equivalent Score}}{\text{Grade to Nearest Month}}$ x Interval Between Tests

Analysis of the Title I participants' performance on the reading comprehension subtest of the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test indicates a high degree of success in producing gains in reading comprehension. Table III shows that all nine grades, which were analyzed by a correlated "t" test showed significant improvement from pre to post. At the eleventh grade level there was only one class and a statistical test could not be employed. When the observed gains were compared to the expected gains, there were statistically significant improvements in average rate of growth for grades three through eight. In grade nine only four classes were available, which made it difficult to obtain statistical significance. However, the observed mean gain of 1.61 was more than a full year better than the expected mean gain for the four classes. While it may not have been statistically significant it was the most impressive gain made at any grade level.

Some of the districts reported their Title I participants' reading performance by the total Gates-MacGinitie test scores. These results are reported in Table IV. The increase in total reading proficiency was statistically significant for grades one through nine. In grades ten, eleven and twelve, there were only two classes available, which made it difficult to achieve statistical significance. The observed gains, however, were impressive at each grade level.

The observed gain was significantly greater than expected in grades three through nine. Again the tenth, eleventh and twelfth grades showed markedly high reading gains which though statistically not significant for the reasons cited above, the practical significance should again be noted.

With the exception of the first grade, the observed gain exceeded the interval between tests. The improvement is particularly high at the secondary

Table III

1974-75 Performance of Pennsylvania* Title I Participants
On The Gates-MacGinitie Reading Comprehension Test

Grade	Number of District Classes	Number of Children	Pre Mean	Post Mean	Observed Gain	"t" Pre-Post	Between Tests	Expected Gain***	"t" Observed vs. Expected Gain
1	9	142	1.36	1.76	.40	3.82**	.50	N/A	N/A
2	51	1,572	1.60	2.37	.77	16.32**	.79	N/A	N/A
3	57	1,759	2.02	2.95	.93	16.57**	.76	.50	7.85**
4	55	1,523	2.72	3.59	.86	17.01**	.77	.52	6.45**
5	45	1,098	3.28	4.22	.94	17.25**	.78	.51	7.96**
6	32	746	3.92	4.98	1.06	14.02**	.78	.51	6.70**
7	15	401	4.52	5.42	.90	5.58**	.72	.45	2.74**
8	12	327	5.31	6.38	1.07	6.10**	.76	.50	3.32**
9	4	135	6.33	7.94	1.61	3.75**	.85	.59	2.28 NS
11	1	28	7.98	8.45	.47	N/A	.80	.58	N/A

*Excluding Philadelphia and Pittsburgh
**Significant at .05 level; degrees of freedom based on number of district classes

***Expected Gain = $\frac{\text{Entering Grade Equivalent Score}}{\text{Grade to Nearest Month}}$ x Interval Between Tests

Table IV

1974-75 Performance of Pennsylvania* Title I Participants
On The Gates-MacGinitie Total Reading Test

Grade	Number of District Classes	Number of Children	Pre Mean	Post Mean	Observed Gain	"t" Pre-Post	Interval Between Tests	Expected Gain***	"t" Observed vs. Expected Gain
1	11	304	1.24	1.76	.52	4.06**	.60	.61	N/A
2	71	2,363	1.64	2.43	.79	16.60**	.77	.63	N/A
3	70	2,179	2.19	3.05	.86	18.52**	.75	.55	5.52**
4	66	2,086	2.91	3.72	.81	17.97**	.77	.55	5.85**
5	55	1,855	3.50	4.28	.78	10.46**	.78	.55	2.64**
6	42	1,350	4.08	4.93	.85	11.29**	.80	.54	4.02**
7	34	1,107	4.63	5.82	1.19	13.30**	.78	.52	7.19**
8	27	752	5.10	6.18	1.08	8.47**	.79	.49	4.78**
9	9	191	6.08	7.47	1.39	6.21**	.80	.54	3.77**
10	2	73	7.86	8.86	1.00	7.69 NS	.90	.72	5.18 NS
11	2	122	8.36	9.55	1.19	12.47 NS	.85	.67	1.93 NS
12	2	90	9.45	10.38	.93	3.00 NS	.85	.68	.55 NS
		12472							

*Excluding Philadelphia and Pittsburgh
**Significant at .05 level; degrees of freedom based on number of district classes

***Expected Gain = $\frac{\text{Entering Grade Equivalent Score}}{\text{Grade to Nearest Month}}$ x Interval Between Tests

level (grades seven through twelve) with gains ranging from nine months to almost fourteen months occurring in from eight to nine months between testing.

The second most commonly administered instrument to assess reading achievement in Title I programs was the Stanford Achievement Reading Test. Table V shows that there was a statistically significant improvement from pre to post at grades two through eight. Only one class was available at the tenth grade level and a correlated "t" test could not be run. The observed gain was greater than the interval between tests at grades five, six and ten and the observed gain was significantly greater than the expected gain in grades three through six on the Stanford Achievement Reading Test.

Table VI indicates the progress of children enrolled in programs using the Metropolitan Achievement Reading Test. Significant improvement from pre- to posttesting was observed at all grade levels. (The correlated "t" test was not run at grade nine because there was only one class.) In grades four through eight the observed gain was greater than the interval between tests indicating a normal rate of growth. When the data was analyzed to determine whether or not there was a significant improvement in the average rate of growth, statistically significant improvements were found in grades four, five and six. Grades seven and eight approached significance but because of the small number of classes at each grade level, statistical significance was not obtained. At each grade level, however, the observed mean gain was much higher than the average expected gain (.99 to .56 at grade seven and 1.10 to .61 at grade eight).

In Table VII the results of the analysis of data from school districts utilizing the Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test are depicted. Statistically significant improvement from pre to post was found at all grade levels where

Table V

1974-75 Performance of Pennsylvania* Title I Participants
On The Stanford Achievement Reading Test

Grade	Number of District Classes	Number of Children	Pre Mean	Post Mean	Observed Gain	"t" Pre-Post	Interval Between Tests	Expected Gain***	"t" Observed vs. Expected Gain
1	6	153	1.35	1.28	-.07	-.18 NS	.95	N/A	N/A
2	88	2,849	1.63	2.37	.74	22.44**	.86	N/A	N/A
3	81	2,814	2.19	2.98	.79	20.79**	.87	.66	2.87**
4	77	2,546	2.80	3.60	.80	19.40**	.86	.62	4.07**
5	60	2,065	3.50	4.41	.91	15.60**	.86	.61	5.07**
6	37	1,237	4.17	5.11	.94	9.92**	.91	.64	3.44**
7	16	491	4.49	5.30	.81	3.46**	.88	.57	.98 NS
8	10	165	4.83	5.58	.75	2.28**	.88	.54	.62 NS
10	1	35	5.67	7.14	1.47	N/A	1.00	.58	N/A

12,355

*Excluding Philadelphia and Pittsburgh
**Significant at .05 level; degrees of freedom based on number of district classes

***Expected Gain = $\frac{\text{Entering Grade Equivalent Score}}{\text{Grade to Nearest Month}}$ x Interval Between Tests

Table VI

1974-75 Performance of Pennsylvania* Title I Participants
On The Metropolitan Achievement Reading Test

Grade	Number of District Classes	Number of Children	Pre Mean	Post Mean	Observed Gain	"t" Pre-Post	Interval Between Tests	Expected Gain***	"t" Observed vs. Expected Gain
1	9	152	1.08	1.63	.55	8.28**	.64	.63	N/A
2	32	1,588	1.70	2.41	.71	24.25**	.81	.73	N/A
3	32	1,288	2.19	2.84	.65	17.68**	.80	.59	1.16 NS
4	31	1,390	2.67	3.53	.86	20.38**	.81	.56	5.51**
5	26	1,085	3.39	4.28	.89	15.53**	.86	.61	4.63**
6	16	602	3.93	4.78	.85	11.18**	.82	.54	3.58**
7	7	193	4.53	5.52	.99	4.46**	.86	.56	1.82 NS
8	8	242	5.23	6.33	1.10	4.44**	.91	.61	2.13 NS
9	1	67	7.13	8.00	.87	N/A	.70	.55	N/A

6607

*Excluding Philadelphia and Pittsburgh
**Significant at .05 level; degrees of freedom based on number of district classes

***Expected Gain = $\frac{\text{Entering Grade Equivalent Score}}{\text{Grade to Nearest Month}}$ x Interval Between Tests

Table VII

1974-75 Performance of Pennsylvania* Title I Participants
On The Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test

Grade	Number of District Classes	Number of Children	Pre Mean	Post Mean	Observed Gain	"t" Pre-Post	Interval Between Tests	Expected Gain***	"t" Observed vs. Expected Gain
2	7	137	1.57	2.24	.67	6.83**	.69	.50	N/A
3	17	430	2.15	2.88	.73	10.45**	.81	.59	1.77 NS
4	22	687	2.71	3.52	.81	11.12**	.80	.54	2.99**
5	23	795	3.24	4.08	.84	8.73**	.73	.46	3.97**
6	21	679	3.72	4.72	1.00	13.44**	.80	.49	6.23**
7	12	497	4.12	5.09	.97	6.72**	.78	.46	3.97**
8	10	276	4.60	5.63	1.03	6.05**	.75	.43	3.69**
9	5	276	5.75	6.97	1.22	6.08**	.80	.51	3.21**

3771

*Excluding Philadelphia and Pittsburgh
**Significant at .05 level; degrees of freedom based on number of district classes

***Expected Gain = $\frac{\text{Entering Grade Equivalent Score}}{\text{Grade to Nearest Month}}$ x Interval Between Tests

the Diagnostic was used. Additionally, the observed gain exceeded the interval between tests at all levels except the second and third grades, which almost equalled the interval between tests. The observed gain was significantly better than the expected gain at grades four through eight. The test was not run at grade two and at grade three the trend was present. (.73 observed to .59 expected) but it did not reach significance.

Various other reading tests were employed by school districts throughout the Commonwealth. These tests were administered to less than ten classes per grade level and were not analyzed separately. Grade equivalent scores on these lesser used tests were combined and analyzed together. Table VIII indicates that there was a significant observed gain at grade levels one through ten when a correlated "t" test was utilized to determine pre-post gains. There was only one class at both the eleventh and twelfth grade levels and the statistical test could not be employed. However, both classes were outstanding. The mean gain for the eleventh grade class was 1.66 when their expected mean gain was only .50 and the twelfth grade class had a mean gain of 1.33 when their expected mean gain was only .52.

The observed gain at every grade level equalled or exceeded the interval between tests and the observed gain was significantly greater than would be expected in grades three through ten.

Mathematics-Statewide. Fewer districts submitted data on mathematics achievement tests. Data was available on only 448 classes. No dominant tests were employed, therefore, grade equivalent scores were combined on all tests for statistical analysis. Table IX summarizes the statistical analysis on all math scores for 98 districts reporting. The percentage of classes where the observed gain exceeded the test interval ranged from 16.4 percent at the second grade level to 64.3 percent at the seventh grade level (excluding the

Table VIII

1974-75 Performance of Pennsylvania* Title I Participants
On All Remaining Tests of Reading****

Grade	Number of District Classes	Number of Children	Pre Mean	Post Mean	Observed Gain	"t" Pre-Post	Interval Between Tests	Expected Gain***	"t" Observed vs. Expected Gain
1	25	644	.93	1.71	.78	4.36**	.78	.69	N/A
2	100	3,865	1.53	2.48	.95	21.83**	.80	.61	N/A
3	118	4,022	2.30	3.21	.91	23.45**	.81	.62	5.95**
4	126	3,656	3.91	3.04	.87	23.27**	.82	.85	5.36**
5	116	2,966	3.61	4.58	.97	21.08**	.83	.61	7.65**
6	87	2,350	4.18	5.12	.94	22.15**	.83	.59	7.74**
7	57	1,781	4.92	5.94	1.01	13.12**	.78	.60	5.79**
8	47	1,360	5.62	6.40	.78	8.93**	.75	.58	2.75**
9	16	534	6.18	7.27	1.09	8.37**	.81	.56	4.12**
10	5	235	6.55	7.80	1.25	10.36**	.78	.51	6.43**
11	1	14	6.83	8.49	1.66	N/A	.80	.50	N/A
12	1	13	7.75	9.08	1.33	N/A	.80	.52	N/A

21440 22439

*Excluding Philadelphia and Pittsburgh
**Significant at .05 level; degrees of freedom based on number of district classes

***Expected Gain = $\frac{\text{Entering Grade Equivalent Score}}{\text{Grade to Nearest Month}}$ x Interval Between Tests

****All available tests other than Gates-MacGinitie, Stanford and Metropolitan Tests

Table IX

Summary of Performance Comparisons By Grade Level
For 98 School DIstricts On All Math Measures
(Philadelphia and Pittsburgh Not Included)

Grade	Number Of District Class Comparisons *	Number Observed Gain > Test Interval	%	Number Observed Gain > Expected Gain	%
1	13	5	38.5%	4	N/A
2	55	9	16.4%	12	N/A
3	75	38	50.7%	50	66.7%
4	90	41	45.6%	53	58.9%
5	87	53	60.9%	61	70.1%
6	64	34	53.1%	41	64.1%
7	28	18	64.3%	24	85.7%
8	27	12	44.4%	20	74.1%
9	6	3	50.0%	4	66.7%
10	2	1	50.0%	2	100.0%
11	1	0	0.0%	1	100.0%

*Number of school districts submitting pre-post data for at least ten students for comparison at this grade level. If a district submits data for more than one test at a particular grade level, it is counted twice.

eleventh grade where only one class was reported). A total of 214, or 48.8 percent of the classes showed a mean gain greater than the interval between tests. The percentage of classes in which the observed gain was greater than the expected ranged from 58.9 percent at the fourth grade level to 85.7 percent at the seventh grade level (excluding the eleventh and twelfth grades because there was only one class). Overall 256 of the 380 classes, or 67.4 percent, showed a greater observed gain than was expected.

Table X shows the summary of the statistical analysis performed on data from all mathematics tests administered to Title I children and reported by the district. Statistically significant pre-post improvement was found at each of the first nine grade levels. At the tenth grade there were only two classes which made it difficult to achieve statistical significance, however, the mean gain of 1.32 was outstanding. The observed gain was significantly higher than would be expected from the third grade through the eighth and at the ninth and tenth grades the trend was clearly in the desired direction, but the number of classes was too small to achieve statistical significance.

Conclusions

The data analyzed in this section consisted of district class means which were analyzed statistically at each grade level. This represents a very conservative and stable unit of analysis in that the degrees of freedom are a function of the number of district class means by grade, not the number of students constituting district classes by grade. For instance, if 50 districts submitted pre-post data on 1200 sixth grades, in 50 classes the pre-post "t" test would be run using the 50 class means. The degrees of freedom, therefore, would be 49 rather than the 1199 which would have been used if the unit of analysis was the individual child.

Table X

1974-75 Performance of Pennsylvania* Title I Participants
On All Mathematics Tests Utilized by School Districts

Grade	Number of District Classes	Number of Children	Pre Mean	Post Mean	Observed Gain	"t" Pre-Post	Interval Between Tests	Expected Gain***	"t" Observed vs. Expected Gain
1	13	368	1.29	1.79	.50	3.14**	.86	1.29	N/A
2	85	1,812	1.73	2.35	.62	12.72**	.80	.69	N/A
3	75	2,401	2.36	3.21	.85	15.48**	.81	.65	3.52**
4	90	3,296	3.16	3.90	.74	14.83**	.79	.62	2.36**
5	87	3,086	3.90	4.80	.90	16.67**	.79	.64	4.31**
6	64	1,958	4.50	5.39	.89	11.73**	.81	.61	3.41**
7	28	755	4.79	5.96	1.17	9.56**	.81	.56	4.42**
8	27	665	5.39	6.45	1.06	6.48**	.80	.54	3.20**
9	6	137	5.32	6.07	.75	3.88**	.79	.47	2.09 NS
10	2	37	6.29	7.61	1.32	2.02 NS	.83	.52	1.08 NS
11	1	38	5.41	7.39	.98	N/A	.80	.43	N/A

14553

*Excluding Philadelphia and Pittsburgh
**Significant at .05 level; degrees of freedom based on number of district classes

***Expected Gain = $\frac{\text{Entering Grade Equivalent Score}}{\text{Grade to Nearest Month}}$ x Interval Between Tests

The results of this analysis indicates Title I participants are generally:

1. Making statistically significant improvement in reading and mathematics.
2. Improving at a rate greater than the interval between tests, i.e., at a rate greater than the national average in many instances and at least as good as expected in most others.
3. Improving at a rate greater than would be expected on the basis of their past performances.

RESULTS OF DATA ANALYSIS

ON TITLE I CHILDREN

IN PHILADELPHIA AND PITTSBURGH

The performance of Title I participants in the cities of Pittsburgh and Philadelphia are analyzed separately from the other districts in the Commonwealth because data was not available by classes. Data was provided by grade level only. The unit for statistical analysis was the child. The situation was further complicated in Pittsburgh when due to technical difficulties pre-post data could only be matched for students in grades five through eight on the Metropolitan Achievement Test. The data are reported on reading and mathematics by city.

Philadelphia-Reading. The California Achievement Test was administered to ESEA Title I students in Philadelphia during the first week in April, 1974 and again during February, 1975. Results were reported by grade level. The unit for statistical analysis was the child, rather than the class which was the unit of statistical analysis for other districts. First grade was not included in the analysis because the California Achievement Test was administered as a posttest only.

Table XI depicts the results of the performance of Philadelphia's Title I students on the reading vocabulary subtest of the California Achievement Test. All eleven grades showed a statistically significant pre-post improvement in reading vocabulary. Outstanding gains were achieved by seventh and eighth graders who achieved better than a year's growth during the time between pretesting and posttesting which constituted 8 academic months. Second graders also achieved an observed gain which was greater than the interval between tests. Other notable performances were recorded at the fifth, sixth, ninth, and twelfth grade levels.

Because the unit for statistical analysis was the child rather than the class, a "t" test to determine whether or not the observed gain was greater than the expected was not performed. In order to obtain some indication,

Table XI

1974-75 Performance of Philadelphia Title I Participants
On The California Achievement Reading Vocabulary Test

Grade	Number of Children	Pre Mean	Post Mean	Observed Gain	"t" Pre-Post	Interval Between Tests	Expected Gain**
1	640	N/A	1.43	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	12,158	1.88	2.73	.85	110.44*	.80	.88
3	12,276	2.75	3.33	.58	61.10*	.80	.81
4	15,042	3.44	3.86	.42	43.92*	.80	.74
5	16,657	3.94	4.72	.78	63.53*	.80	.67
6	16,038	4.82	5.58	.76	63.82*	.80	.68
7	15,628	5.48	6.50	1.02	59.78*	.80	.65
8	13,121	6.44	7.57	1.13	66.01*	.80	.67
9	12,752	7.45	8.18	.73	46.05*	.80	.69
10	11,593	8.05	8.52	.47	30.98*	.80	.66
11	9,962	8.93	9.30	.37	18.93*	.80	.68
12	8,515	9.39	10.15	.76	33.72*	.80	.64

*Significant at .05 level; degrees of freedom based on number of students in grade level

**Expected Gain = $\frac{\text{Pre-Mean Grade Equivalent Score}}{\text{Grade to Nearest Month at Pretesting}}$ x Interval Between Tests

however, an expected gain was determined by utilizing the pre-means for the students, the grade level of students at pre-test and the interval between tests. Table XI indicates that the observed mean gain was greater than the expected mean gain in six of the eleven grades, with outstanding performances at both the seventh and eighth grades.

The results of the reading comprehension subtest are reported in Table XII. It can be seen that, again, there was a statistically significant improvement from pre- to posttesting at all eleven grade levels. When the observed mean gain per grade level was compared to the interval between tests, there were two grades which exceeded the interval between tests (grades three and eight). When the observed mean gain was compared to the expected mean gain the performance was somewhat better. Five grade levels exceeded the expected, while three others were fairly close to the expected mean gain.

A total reading test score was developed for the California Achievement Test and results are shown in Table XIII. At two grade levels the observed mean gain exceeded the interval between tests (second grade and eighth grade) while three others were close (grades six, seven and twelve). The observed mean gain exceeded the expected mean gain at five grade levels with the most outstanding performance occurring at the eighth grade level.

Philadelphia-Mathematics. The mathematics subtests of the California Achievement Test were given only in grades one through eight. Again at the first grade level there was no pretest with the California Achievement Test, therefore, only the posttest mean is given and there was no statistical analysis.

Table XIV gives the results of the analysis of the data on the mathematics computation subtest of the California Achievement Test. There was a

Table XII

1974-75 Performance of Philadelphia Title I Participants
On The California Achievement Reading Comprehension Test

Grade	Number of Children	Pre Mean	Post Mean	Observed Gain	"t" Pre-Post	Interval Between Tests	Expected Gain**
1	582	N/A	1.58	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	11,779	1.82	2.57	.75	71.68*	.80	.86
3	12,206	2.63	3.45	.82	69.48*	.80	.78
4	15,023	3.65	4.12	.47	39.70*	.80	.79
5	16,602	4.25	4.88	.63	46.50*	.80	.72
6	16,000	4.97	5.75	.78	63.15*	.80	.70
7	15,596	5.70	6.16	.46	31.80*	.80	.68
8	13,114	6.26	7.12	.86	53.73*	.80	.65
9	12,750	7.23	7.90	.67	43.21*	.80	.66
10	11,634	7.89	8.50	.61	36.39*	.80	.65
11	9,969	8.95	8.99	.04	3.02*	.80	.67
12	8,513	9.26	9.96	.70	28.65*	.80	.63

*Significant at .05 level; degrees of freedom based on number of students in grade level

**Expected Gain = $\frac{\text{Pre-Mean Grade Equivalent Score}}{\text{Grade to Nearest Month at Pretesting}}$ x Interval Between Tests

Table XIII

1974-75 Performance of Philadelphia Title I Participants
On The California Achievement Total Reading Test

Grade	Number of Children	Pre Mean	Post Mean	Observed Gain	"t" Pre-Post	Interval Between Tests	Expected Gain**
1	578	N/A	1.46	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	11,743	1.85	2.66	.81	109.38*	.80	.87
3	12,098	2.68	3.38	.70	73.29*	.80	.79
4	14,881	3.56	4.01	.45	48.64*	.80	.80
5	16,476	4.12	4.77	.65	59.20*	.80	.70
6	15,904	4.86	5.64	.78	78.64*	.80	.68
7	15,447	5.56	6.31	.75	58.53*	.80	.66
8	12,965	6.33	7.34	1.01	77.97*	.80	.66
9	12,613	7.33	8.04	.71	57.79*	.80	.67
10	11,448	7.97	8.52	.55	42.40*	.80	.66
11	9,820	8.93	9.20	.27	15.37*	.80	.68
12	8,373	9.38	10.14	.76	36.84*	.80	.64

*Significant at .05 level; degrees of freedom based on number of students in grade level

**Expected Gain = $\frac{\text{Pre-Mean Grade Equivalent Score}}{\text{Grade to Nearest Month At Pretesting}}$ x Interval Between Tests

Table XIV

1974-75 Performance of Philadelphia Title I Participants
On The California Achievement Math Computation Test

Grade	Number of Children	Pre Mean	Post Mean	Observed Gain	"t" Pre-Post	Interval Between Tests	Expected Gain**
1	582	N/A	1.36	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	11,843	1.70	2.30	.60	89.91*	.80	.80
3	12,148	2.33	3.27	.94	123.67*	.80	.69
4	14,911	3.42	3.62	.20	26.42*	.80	.74
5	16,242	3.73	4.85	1.12	127.48*	.80	.63
6	15,424	5.02	5.70	.68	78.28*	.80	.70
7	15,237	5.74	6.14	.40	33.68*	.80	.69
8	12,901	6.23	6.93	.70	52.52*	.80	.65

*Significant at .05 level; degrees of freedom based on number of students in grade level

**Expected Gain = $\frac{\text{Pre-Mean Grade Equivalent Score}}{\text{Grade to Nearest Month at Pretesting}}$ x Interval Between Tests

statistically significant improvement from pre- to posttesting at all seven grade levels. The third and fifth grades had an observed mean gain that was greater than the interval between, with the fifth graders showing an outstanding growth of 1.12 over the eight-month period. When the observed mean gain was compared to the expected mean gain, three grade levels (third, fifth and eighth) exceeded their expected mean gain, while another (the sixth graders) were close to their expected mean gain.

On the mathematics concepts and problems subtest of the California Achievement Test, the fifth graders, again, had an outstanding performance (see Table XV). The fifth graders went from a pre-mean of 4.15 to a post-test mean of 5.13 for an observed gain of .98, or almost a full year in the interval between tests. The eighth grade also exceeded the interval between tests with an observed mean gain of .82. The second and sixth graders also came close to achieving eight months improvement in the interval between tests. Three grade levels exceeded their expected mean gain lead by the fifth grade performance (.98 compared to .71). The eighth graders' expected mean gain was .63 and they achieved .82 and the sixth graders' achieved a mean gain of .75 compared to the expected mean gain of .74. All pre-post improvements were statistically significant.

When the total mathematics achievement test scores were analyzed, the fifth graders' outstanding performance on the subtest was reflected in the results and they were the only grade level to exceed the interval between tests (1.07 over 8 months). The fifth graders, as well as the eighth graders (.75 compared to .65) were the grades where the mean observed gain was greater than the mean expected gain, though the third and sixth grades came close. All pre-post gains were statistically significant. (See Table XVI)

Table XV

1974-75 Performance of Philadelphia Title I Participants On The California Achievement Math Concepts and Problems Test

Grade	Number of Children	Pre Mean	Post Mean	Observed Gain	"t" Pre-Post	Interval Between Tests	Expected Gain**
1	572	N/A	1.62	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	11,744	2.07	2.83	.76	84.74*	.80	.97
3	12,049	2.93	3.33	.40	42.43*	.80	.87
4	14,668	3.56	3.96	.40	45.44*	.80	.77
5	16,214	4.15	5.13	.98	97.62*	.80	.71
6	15,574	5.24	5.99	.75	74.52*	.80	.74
7	14,888	5.88	6.03	.15	11.07*	.80	.70
8	12,548	6.09	6.91	.82	57.12*	.80	.63

*Significant at .05 level; degrees of freedom based on number of students in grade level

**Expected Gain = $\frac{\text{Pre-Mean Grade Equivalent Score}}{\text{Grade to Nearest Month At Pretesting}}$ x Interval Between Tests

Table XVI

1974-75 Performance of Philadelphia Title I Participants
On The California Achievement Math Total Test

Grade	Number of Children	Pre Mean	Post Mean	Observed Gain	"t" Pre-Post	Interval Between Tests	Expected Gain**
1	549	N/A	1.45	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	11,608	1.84	2.50	.66	104.90*	.80	.87
3	11,950	2.55	3.29	.74	105.62*	.80	.76
4	14,512	3.48	3.75	.27	39.21*	.80	.75
5	15,948	3.87	4.94	1.07	139.16*	.80	.66
6	15,224	5.08	5.77	.69	92.04*	.80	.71
7	14,629	5.78	6.19	.41	38.81*	.80	.69
8	12,279	6.26	7.01	.75	67.28*	.80	.65

*Significant at .05 level; degrees of freedom based on number of students in grade level

**Expected Gain = $\frac{\text{Pre-Mean Grade Equivalent Score}}{\text{Grade to Nearest Month at Pretesting}}$ x Interval Between Tests

Pittsburgh-Reading. The performance of Pittsburgh children enrolled in programs submitting the Metropolitan Reading Test scores is shown in Table XVII. The increase in reading proficiency from pre- to posttesting was significant at all grade levels (five through eight). The observed mean gain exceeded the expected mean gain in grades seven and eight, but did not quite equal the expected at grades five and six, though it was close.

Table XVII

1974-75 Performance of Pittsburgh Title I Participants
On The Metropolitan Reading Test

Grade	Number of Children	Pre Mean	Post Mean	Observed Gain	"t" Pre-Post	Interval Between Tests	Expected Gain**
5	351	2.79	3.15	.36	8.75*	.70	.38
6	580	3.59	3.98	.39	12.77*	.70	.41
7	773	3.91	4.49	.58	16.42*	.70	.39
8	743	4.63	5.13	.50	12.20*	.70	.40

*Significant at .05 level; degrees of freedom based on number of district classes

**Expected Gain = $\frac{\text{Entering Grade Equivalent Score}}{\text{Grade to Nearest Month}}$ x Interval Between Tests

Other Title I children were administered the Iowa Silent Reading Test. The children in grades four, five and six who took the Iowa were all from parochial schools. Table XVIII indicates that the observed gain from pre- to posttesting was statistically significant at all levels and the observed gain exceeded the expected mean gain at each grade level. While a statistical test was not run to determine whether the average rate of gain was significantly higher than the average expected gain because no class data was available, it is evident that statistical significance would have been achieved.

Table XVIII

1974-75 Performance of Pittsburgh Title I Participants
On The Iowa Silent Reading Test

Grade	Number of Children	Pre Mean	Post Mean	Observed Gain	"t" Pre-Post	Interval Between Tests	Expected Gain***
4*	13	3.99	5.25	1.26	6.25**	.40	.40
5*	58	5.27	6.38	1.11	9.80**	.40	.42
6*	83	6.70	8.37	1.67	9.98**	.40	.44
7	803	6.08	7.15	1.07	22.58**	.80	.69
8	819	6.57	7.60	1.03	25.36**	.80	.66

*Parochial schools only
**Significant at .05 level; degrees of freedom based on number of district classes

***Expected Gain = $\frac{\text{Entering Grade Equivalent Score}}{\text{Grade to Nearest Month}}$ x Interval Between Tests

Pittsburgh maintains a reading clinic to which students are referred by teachers. Students spent varying amounts of time at the clinic. Upon referral they were tested with the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test and upon return to the classroom they were posttested with the same instrument. Table XIX depicts the performance of Pittsburgh Title I Reading Clinic students on the vocabulary subtest of the Gates-MacGinitie.

In grades two through nine, a statistically significant improvement was evidenced from pre- to posttesting. The best performance was at the sixth grade level where 84 participants showed a mean gain of 1.08. The varying intervals between tests precluded comparison of mean observed gain with the mean expected gain.

Table XIX

1974-75 Performance of Reading Clinic Students* of Pittsburgh Title I Participants On The Gates Mac-Ginitie Reading Vocabulary Test

Grade	Number of Children	Pre Mean	Post Mean	Observed Gain	"t" Pre-Post	Interval Between Tests	Expected Gain
2	72	1.93	2.59	.66	9.98*	--	--
3	78	2.74	3.59	.85	10.10*	--	--
4	61	2.59	3.34	.75	10.43*	--	--
5	94	3.50	4.28	.78	10.27*	--	--
6	84	4.41	5.49	1.08	10.75*	--	--
7		5.09	5.95	.86	7.08*	--	--
8	5	4.93	5.83	.90	6.55*	--	--
9	11	5.66	6.63	.97	4.06*	--	--
10	4	4.05	4.83	.78	1.48	--	--
11	7	3.91	4.43	.52	2.21	--	--
12	4	4.50	4.63	.13	.26	--	--

*The interval between tests was not computed on classes because individual students were assigned at various times and the interval between tests varied. This also made it impossible to compute the expected gain.

Table XX indicates that the Pittsburgh Title I Reading Clinic students also showed a statistically significant improvement from pre to post on the reading comprehension subtest of the Gates-MacGinitie, except at the tenth and twelfth grade levels where the number of students was small (n=4). While comparison of the observed mean gain with expected mean gain was not possible, the observed mean gains were very impressive.

Table XX

1974-75 Performance of [illegible]g Clinic Students* of Pittsburgh Title I Participants On the Gat[illegible]ac-Ginitie Reading Comprehension Test

Grade	Number of Children	Pre Mean	Post Mean	Observed Gain	"t" Pre-Post	Interval Between Tests	Expected Gain***
2	70	1.76	2.42	.66	7.49*	--	--
3	78	2.63	3.34	.71	7.36*	--	--
4	61	2.45	3.22	.77	9.19*	--	--
5	93	3.20	4.31	1.11	11.03*	--	--
6	84	4.34	5.67	1.33	9.96*	--	--
7	84	4.96	5.65	.69	5.42*	--	--
8	56	4.70	5.70	1.00	6.76*	--	--
9	12	5.53	6.53	1.00	2.26*	--	--
10	4	4.05	4.98	.93	1.18	--	--
11	7	3.96	5.06	1.10	2.94*	--	--
12	4	4.75	6.93	2.18	2.07	--	--

*The interval between tests was not computed on classes because individual students were assigned at various times and the interval between tests varied. This also made it impossible to compute the expected gain.

Pittsburgh-Mathematics. The Metropolitan Math Test was the only instrument administered to the Pittsburgh Title I Participants to assess learning growth in mathematics.

There was a statistically significant pre-post gain at every grade level. (See Table XXI) The observed gain exceeded the expected gain in grades seven

and eight and equalled the expected gain at grade six.

Table XXI

1974-75 Performance of Pittsburgh Title I Participants
On The Metropolitan Math Test

Grade	Number of Children	Pre Mean	Post Mean	Observed Gain	"t" Pre-Post	Interval Between Tests	Expected Gain**
5	193	3.31	3.65	.34	8.47*	.70	.45
6	451	3.91	4.36	.45	17.87*	.70	.45
7	675	4.48	5.03	.55	18.51*	.70	.44
8	730	5.34	5.85	.51	16.33*	.70	.46

*Significant at .05 level; degrees of freedom based on number of district classes

**Expected Gain = $\frac{\text{Entering Grade Equivalent Score}}{\text{Grade to Nearest Month}}$ x Interval Between Tests

Conclusions for Philadelphia and Pittsburgh

The following conclusions may be drawn from the results of standardized testing in Philadelphia and Pittsburgh:

1. Philadelphia students' achievement on the reading vocabulary subtests was better than their performance on the reading comprehension subtests of the California Achievement Tests.
2. Outstanding performances were turned in by eighth grade students on both reading subtests and seventh graders' performance on the reading vocabulary subtest was outstanding.
3. Fifth grade students had outstanding performances on both mathematics subtests of the California Achievement Tests, and the eighth graders' observed mean gains were higher than expected on both mathematics subtests also. Sixth graders performed about as well as expected.
4. Performance on both reading and mathematics tests in Philadelphia

indicated mixed performance with some grades performing outstandingly, others poorly. Generally, however, the results were favorable.

5. The reading performance of students upon which data was available in Pittsburgh indicates that students are doing as well as expected and in many cases much better than expected.
6. Impressive results were obtained on students in the Reading Clinic in Pittsburgh on the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test.
7. Pittsburgh Title I students were doing as well as expected, for the most part, on mathematics achievement test.