

1978

Updating the Title I Needs Assessment and Project Proposal for the 1978-79 School Year

Mary Emma Thompson

Eastern Illinois University

This research is a product of the graduate program in [Educational Administration](#) at Eastern Illinois University. [Find out more](#) about the program.

Recommended Citation

Thompson, Mary Emma, "Updating the Title I Needs Assessment and Project Proposal for the 1978-79 School Year" (1978). *Masters Theses*. 3252.

<https://thekeep.eiu.edu/theses/3252>

This is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Theses & Publications at The Keep. It has been accepted for inclusion in Masters Theses by an authorized administrator of The Keep. For more information, please contact tabruns@eiu.edu.

PAPER CERTIFICATE #2

TO: Graduate Degree Candidates who have written formal theses.

SUBJECT: Permission to reproduce theses.

The University Library is receiving a number of requests from other institutions asking permission to reproduce dissertations for inclusion in their library holdings. Although no copyright laws are involved, we feel that professional courtesy demands that permission be obtained from the author before we allow theses to be copied.

Please sign one of the following statements:

Booth Library of Eastern Illinois University has my permission to lend my thesis to a reputable college or university for the purpose of copying it for inclusion in that institution's library or research holdings.

July 27, 1978
Date

I respectfully request Booth Library of Eastern Illinois University not allow my thesis be reproduced because _____

July 27, 1978
Date

pdm

UPDATING THE TITLE I NEEDS ASSESSMENT AND
PROJECT PROPOSAL FOR THE 1978-79 SCHOOL YEAR
(TITLE)

BY

MARY EMMA THOMPSON

FIELD EXPERIENCE
THESIS

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF
SPECIALIST IN EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL, EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY
CHARLESTON, ILLINOIS

1978

YEAR

I HEREBY RECOMMEND THIS THESIS BE ACCEPTED AS FULFILLING
THIS PART OF THE GRADUATE DEGREE CITED ABOVE //

July 26, 1978
DATE

7-26-78
DATE

UPDATING THE TITLE I NEEDS ASSESSMENT
AND PROJECT PROPOSAL FOR THE
1978-79 SCHOOL YEAR

BY

MARY EMMA THOMPSON

B. S. in Ed., Florida Atlantic University, 1966
M. S. in Ed., Eastern Illinois University, 1975

ABSTRACT OF A FIELD STUDY

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Specialist in Education at the Graduate School
of Eastern Illinois University

CHARLESTON, ILLINOIS
1978

370651

The field experience consisted of updating the needs assessment and the Title I Project Proposal for the 1978-79 school year for Pittsfield Community Unit District #10.

One measure of the level of achievement for the students was the use of the 1977 results of the annual testing program. Test scores from the Metropolitan Readiness Test for grade one, the S.R.A. Achievement Test for grades two through eight, and the California Achievement Test for grades nine through twelve were used. For grades one through eight students were classified as at or above grade level, .5 grade below grade level, 1.0 grade below grade level, 1.5 grades below grade level, 2.0 grades below grade level, or 2.0+ grades below grade level. Information concerning grades nine through twelve was received from the guidance counselor. Those students in grades one through three who are more than .5 grade below grade level are considered to be eligible for the Title I Program. Students in grades four through twelve should be more than 1.0 grade below grade level to be considered eligible for Title I.

A second source of information was a teacher survey form that was prepared by the writer. On the survey form the classroom teachers were asked to evaluate their students according to the three objectives that are listed in the Title I Project Proposal. The objectives concern achievement, self-concept and attitude toward school. In addition the teachers were asked to identify learning disabled and educationally handicapped students according to grade

level and level of achievement.

Data from the two sources were compared and were used in the preparation of the needs assessment. The needs assessment was written in a form that was similar to the form that was used previously.

The eligibility of the attendance centers for Title I funds was determined by the use of data concerning free and reduced lunches as an indication of the number of children from low income families. The percent of children from low income families for the entire district was determined. Each attendance center in the district had to meet or exceed the percent of children from low income families for the district in order to be eligible for Title I funds.

The budget and the expenditures from last year were considered in preparing the budget for 1978-79. Job descriptions were included for the secretary and the Title I teachers for the first time. The number of Title I participants was estimated from past enrollments.

Except for the needs assessment, Part II of the Title I Project Proposal remained basically the same. Changes concerned the inclusion of secondary English for East Pike High School and the mandated change in the testing program.

The Title I Project Proposal was presented to the Parent Advisory Council.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter

I.	GENERAL INFORMATION CONCERNING THE FIELD EXPERIENCE	1
II.	LOG OF ACTIVITIES	6
III.	PREPARATION OF THE NEEDS ASSESSMENT	9
	Test Results	
	Teacher Survey Form	
	Findings	
	Writing the Needs Assessment	
IV.	DETERMINATION OF ELIGIBLE ATTENDANCE AND PROJECT AREAS	19
V.	EVALUATION	20

Appendix

A.	RESULTS OF ACHIEVEMENT TESTS	22
B.	TEACHER SURVEY FORM	29
C.	RESULTS OF TEACHER SURVEY	32
D.	DISTRICTWIDE RESULTS OF TESTS AND SURVEY	39
E.	TITLE I PROJECT PROPOSAL	42

LIST OF TABLES

Table

1.	Placement from Test Results	10
2.	Number of Students Qualifying for Title I Reading	13
3.	Number of Students Qualifying for Title I Mathematics	14
4.	Evaluation Results for Objectives A (Improving Self-concept) and B (Improving Attitude toward School)	15
5.	LD and EH Students by Grade Level and Achievement	17
6.	Reading Test Results	23
7.	Mathematics Test Results	26
8.	Reading (Teacher Survey)	33
9.	Mathematics (Teacher Survey)	36
10.	Districtwide Results for Reading	40
11.	Districtwide Results for Mathematics	41

PREFACE

After the writer discussed possible projects for a field experience with Dr. Smitley, administrative work in Title I seemed to be the best choice for study. After discussing the field experience with Mr. Seymour, the superintendent of Pittsfield Community Unit District # 10, and Mr. Scranton, the assistant superintendent and director of Title I, the updating of the needs assessment and the project proposal for Title I were selected.

CHAPTER I

GENERAL INFORMATION

CONCERNING THE FIELD EXPERIENCE

The field experience consisted of updating the needs assessment and the Title I Project Proposal for the 1978-79 school year for Pittsfield Community Unit District #10. The first step in the field experience was to discuss the project with Delbert Scranton, Assistant Superintendent, who directs the Title I Program. The results of the S.R.A. Achievement tests were selected as one source of data to show the level of achievement of the students in grades two through eight. The results of the Metropolitan Readiness Tests were used for grade one. Both tests are given in the spring of each year. The results of the 1977 tests were used because the results of the 1978 testing program would not be available before the Title I Project Proposal was completed.

The collection of data was discussed to determine how extensive the information should be. The proposed plan was simplified but still included information that had not been considered in the past.

The tables for data are designed to show the grade equivalent for the students in each grade in each attendance center. The students who have been classified as educationally handicapped (EH) or learning disabled (LD) have been identified. These students are receiving assistance, primarily in reading and language arts, so it is questionable whether these students should

be placed in the Title I Reading Program also. The names of the EH and LD students were obtained from their teachers or their principals' offices.

As a second source of information the writer prepared a teacher survey form. The survey form was designed to determine the levels of achievement of the students by teacher judgment. The cover letter explained that the results of the achievement tests had already been used as a source of information in order to discourage the use of the tests results by the classroom teachers. The same measurements were used for placement that were used for the achievement tests.

The Title I Program is based primarily on improving achievement. However, objectives related to improving self-concepts and improving attitudes toward school are included in the Title I Project Proposal. In order to obtain information concerning these objectives, it was necessary to rely on teacher evaluation. On the survey form a column was provided to enable teachers to indicate at each level of achievement the number of students considered to have poor self-concepts. Another column was provided to show the number of students who were considered to have poor attitudes toward school. In a fourth column the teacher was to indicate the number of students at each level of achievement that were in EH or LD classes.

The results from the teacher survey forms were tabulated for each school and combined for each grade level. Adjustments were

made for the teachers who did not respond, and the results for achievement were compared with the results from the achievement tests.

Shortly before the Title I Project Proposal was completed some basic English courses for East Pike High School students, who were achieving below grade level, were dropped because of the retirement of the teacher who taught the courses. Since the school qualifies for Title I funds, English was written into the Title I Project Proposal for this school. The number of eligible students for each grade was reported by the guidance counselor who used the results from the California Achievement Test.

Following the collection of data from the achievement tests and the teacher survey forms, the needs assessment was written in a form similar to the one that was written previously.

Part I, Section I of the Title I Project Proposal concerns the eligibility of the attendance centers in the district for Title I funds. Each district selects the criteria that will be used to determine eligibility for these funds. In the Pittsfield District, free or reduced lunches are used to determine eligibility. The enrollments for the attendance centers were available from the central office. Since the local Parent Teacher Associations sponsor the hot lunch programs, it was necessary to contact the building principals for information concerning free and reduced lunches. Using the free and reduced lunches as an indication of low income, the percent of the total enrollment of the

district who were from low income families was determined. Thus the basis for determining the eligibility of each attendance center was established. The percent of the enrollment in each attendance center from low income families must equal or exceed the percent for the entire district in order to be eligible for Title I funds. (See Appendix E, Part I, Section I.)

Part I, Section II is the budget. Although it is impossible to know what expenditures will be for the coming year, it is important to make fairly close estimates. A variation of more than ten percent either above or below the amount that is listed for any line item requires an amendment to the original proposal.

In the budget the 1978-79 salaries were increased five percent. No decision had been made concerning salaries, so it was decided that this increase would keep the amount within the ten percent range. The amount for teaching supplies was reduced since the expenditures for last year were less than the amount that was budgeted and no large increase was expected for the coming year. The amount that was budgeted for improvement of instruction was reduced also. The Budget was based on last year's budget and expenditures. (See Appendix E.)

Part I, Section III concerns the project staff. It is the same as last year's proposal except for the salaries and the addition of job descriptions for the secretary and the teachers. After the teacher's job description was written, it was read and approved by the teachers in Title I.

The estimated number of participants for grades one through eight was based on past enrollment. For grades nine through twelve it was somewhat lower than the needs assessment indicated since past experience shows that all of the students who were eligible were not involved in the program.

Funding for instructional activities indicated how much of the budgeted money was expected to be spent in each area.

Part II, Section I includes the needs assessment. Item D is the same as last year except for the inclusion of secondary English. Part II, Section II has been changed to show the growth in normal curve equivalents (NCE) using the new mandated testing program. Secondary English is included for the first time. Part II, Section III is basically the same as it was last year. Sections V, VI, VII, and IX also remain much the same as last year.

The completed Title I Project Proposal was presented to the Parent Advisory Council.

CHAPTER II

LOG OF ACTIVITIES

For the week of:

August 15

The field experience was discussed with Mr. Scranton with emphasis on the needs assessment. S.R.A. Achievement Test results, Metropolitan Readiness Test results, materials related to the needs assessment, and a copy of the 1977-78 Title I Project Proposal were received. Plans for tabulating test results were formulated. Tabulations were begun.

August 22

Goals and objectives for the Title I Project Proposal were reviewed. A teacher survey form was prepared for evaluation of the students by the classroom teachers. The needs assessment was discussed at the Title I teachers' meeting. The survey form was presented for evaluation by the teachers. The proposed change from special education to EH and LD was accepted. The teachers were asked to supply information regarding EH and LD students from the outlying schools. Information from the Pittsfield schools was collected. Tabulation of data continued.

September 12

Tabulation of scores continued. Some previous tabulations

were rechecked.

September 19

Tabulation of scores continued.

November 13

A brief presentation was given at the Parent Advisory Council meeting concerning the teacher survey form.

December 5

Tabulation of test scores was completed.

January 9

Masters for the teacher survey form and a cover letter were typed and copies were made for the classroom teachers.

January 16

The teacher survey forms were passed out at the Title I teachers' meeting for distribution in the schools. The forms were discussed so that the teachers could answer questions that might be asked.

March 6

Most of the teacher survey forms were received by this time so tabulation of the results was begun.

March 20

More teacher survey forms had been received. Tabulations were completed.

April 24

Tables for the needs assessment were completed and the needs assessment was written.

May 1

Part I of the Title I Project Proposal was completed.

Parts II and III were reviewed and revisions were made where they were needed.

May 8

The Parent Advisory Council meeting was held. The purpose of Title I was explained, slides of some Title I classroom activities were shown, and the Title I Project Proposal was presented and discussed.

CHAPTER III

PREPARATION OF THE NEEDS ASSESSMENT

Test Results

The Metropolitan Readiness Test scores from the spring of 1977 were used to determine the level of achievement of the first grade students. The S.R.A. Achievement Test scores were used to determine the level of achievement for the students in grades two through eight. The results from the tests that were given in the spring of 1977 were used because the test results for the current year are received about the time that the Title I Project Proposal should be completed.

The model that was to be used for collecting the data from the test scores was discussed and the proposed model was simplified. The model that was used included more information than was necessary for the needs assessment, but it provided information for comparison with present programs and indicated that some changes may be needed.

The test results for each grade for each school were recorded according to the level of achievement of each student. (See Table 1.) The students in grades one through three are considered eligible for Title I Reading or Mathematics if they are .5 grade below grade level in either area. The students in grades four through eight qualify for the Title I Programs if they are one or more grades below grade level on the tests.

In addition those students that were in learning disabilities

Table 1

Placement from Test Results

Metropolitan Readiness Tests

Stanines 1 - 3 Below grade level

Stanines 4 - 9 At or above grade level

S.R.A. Achievement Test Grade two

G.E.

1 - 9 and above At or above grade level

1 - 4 to 1 - 8 .5 grade below grade level

1 - 0 to 1 - 3 1.0 grade below grade level

Grade three

2 - 9 and above At or above grade level

2 - 4 to 2 - 8 .5 grade below grade level

1 - 9 to 2 - 3 1.0 grade below grade level

1 - 4 to 1 - 8 1.5 grades below grade level

1 - 0 to 1 - 3 2.0 grades below grade level

Grades four to eight

2.0+ grades below grade level

(LD) and educationally handicapped (EH) classes were identified.

LD and EH classes are usually related to reading and language arts, so it is questionable whether these students should be placed in the Title I Reading Program because of the amount of time that they would be spending outside of their regular classrooms. The results were not actually used in preparing the needs assessment.

Separate tables for reading and mathematics were prepared to show the level of achievement of students at each grade level for each school. The results for each level of achievement were totaled. (See Appendix A.) The totals were transferred to another table for comparison with the results of the teacher survey that was conducted. (See Appendix D.)

Teacher Survey Form

For additional information concerning the needs of the students, a teacher survey form was prepared for distribution to the classroom teachers. A sample copy was prepared for evaluation by the Title I teachers. It was recommended that LD and EH classes should be used instead of special education classes. The change was made. The forms were prepared and distributed in January. At the Title I teachers' meeting in January the survey form was discussed, and the forms were given to the teachers for distribution in the schools.

A cover letter was attached to each form to explain the purpose of the form. The forms included columns for the teacher's evaluation of the students for the three objectives that are listed in the Title I Project Proposal. The classifications for achievement for the test results were used on the survey form. The form also included a column to indicate the number of students in LD and EH classes. (See Appendix B.)

When the results were received, they were tabulated in the same manner in which the test results had been tabulated. (See

Appendix C.) The results for column two (poor self-concept, column three (poor attitude toward school), and column four (LD and EH students) were included only on the table for reading since it was concluded that the results on the reading and mathematics would be basically the same.

Findings

The data from the achievement tests and the teacher survey forms for the district were compiled. (See Appendix D.) In comparing the data from the two sources of information it was found that the teachers tended to rate students higher on their achievement than the test results placed them. (See Appendix D.) This might indicate that the tests were not measuring what was being taught and/or that some students did not perform as well on the achievement tests as they did on daily work. The results of the teacher survey from East, South, and Higbee schools were incomplete, so no comparison could be made for those schools. For placing students in Title I a combination of test results and teacher evaluations are used, so the number of students who qualify would probably fall between the numbers that are listed for the test results and the teacher survey. (See Tables 2 and 3.)

From the information that is available it may be concluded that the only schools that have an adequate number of Title I teachers available are East and South schools. Pearl School is acceptable if only the teacher survey is considered. However, the number of qualified students in reading is reduced somewhat by

Table 2

Number of Students qualifying for Title I Reading

Grade	Schools											
	Baylis		Milton		Nebo		Pearl		East		Total	
	T	S	T	S	T	S	T	S	T	S	T	S
1	2	2	3	5	2	5	3	1	4	6	14	19
	South											
2	3	2	2		5	1	8	1	18	18	36	22
3		3		2	1		5	3	4	8	10	17
4	4		2	1			1		2		9	1
	Higbee											
5	2	2	3		8	3	5	3	8	3	26	11
6	3	1	5	1	7		9	9	22		46	11
7	3	1	16	12	2	2	8	4	26	5	55	24
8	3	3	5	3	9	3			18	16	35	25
Total	20	14	36	24	34	14	39	21	102	56	231	130
	T - Test Results						S - Teacher Survey					

the placement of some of them in LD or EH classes. It may be considered more detrimental than beneficial for these students to be placed in the Title I Reading Program because of the amount of time that would be spent outside of the regular classroom. In addition, it must be considered that parents may refuse to allow their children to participate in the program. Due to these considerations it may be concluded that the programs are at least adequate in all of the schools except Milton and Higbee. An ex-

Table 4
Evaluation Results
for Objectives A (Improving Self-concept)
and B (Improving Attitudes toward School)

Grade	Schools											
	Baylis		Milton		Nebo		Pearl		East		Total	
	S	A	S	A	S	A	S	A	S	A	S	A
1	3	1	7	3	2		1		16	5	28	10
	South											
2	2	1	3		3		1	1	11	10	20	12
3	1	3		1					8	3	10	7
4	2	1			1						3	1
	Higbee											
5	1			1	1	1	1	1	1	8	4	11
6	1						2	2	20	23	22	25
7	3	1	4	4	1	1	3	4	19	15	30	25
8	1	2	5	6				1	9	12	15	21
Total	14	9	19	15	8	2	7	10	84	76	132	112
S - Poor Self-concept A - Poor Attitude toward School												

staff is not large enough to accommodate them, it appears that some other adjustments in the school program are necessary in order to meet the needs of these children. Probably the best approach to dealing with these problems is to provide a well-developed guidance program. Past arrangements with the Pike County Mental Health Clinic have not proved satisfactory because assist-

ance was attempted without any direct contact with the students. It may be possible to work out a more satisfactory arrangement rather than to hire a guidance counselor.

The last area that was explored was the number and the achievement of students who are in LD and EH classes. (See Table 5.) Information for the table was taken from the teacher survey results, although last year's enrollment in these classes was recorded on the test results. (See Appendix D.) In view of the fact that some of these students are at least very near grade level in achievement, it seems that they have made the necessary adjustments for them to be successful in school. The progress of these students should be reviewed and their removal from the program should be seriously considered. Considering the number of students who are well below their grade levels in achievement, the time of the LD and EH teachers could be used to a better advantage by replacing these students with others who have more need of the special services. Also there is a strong indication of a need to expand special education services because of the number of low achievers. At present, placement of students is rather slow because of the shortage of personnel for testing students in the Two Rivers Special Education District. In addition to a more rapid testing and placement service, parent education concerning the programs that are provided seems to be necessary. Some parents refuse to have their children tested or, once they have tested, refuse to allow them to be placed in the program.

Table 5

LD and EH Students by Grade Level and Achievement

Grade Placement	At or Above Grade Level	.5 Grade Below Level	1.0 Grade Below Level	1.5 Grade Below Level	2.0 Grade Below Level	2.0+ Grade Below Level
1	1	1	3	2		
2	1	4	4			
3		5	7		1	2
4	3	1	4			
5				5	1	2
6					1	
7				1	2	3
8					2	

Writing the Needs Assessment

Various needs assessments were read for comparison purposes. The general form of the needs assessment that had been used previously was followed. The information from Tables 1 and 2 was used. Since the results of the teacher survey were incomplete, the results of the survey were adjusted to approximately the number of the total enrollment for each grade that would qualify for the Title I Program. Information concerning self-concept and attitude toward school were included for the first time.

Toward the end of the study it was decided to drop some basic English courses at East Pike High School in Milton. Since the school qualifies for Title I funds, it was decided to include English for East Pike in the Title I Project Proposal for the 1978-79 school year. The statistics were provided by the guidance counselor from data from the California Achievement Test.

For the needs assessment see Part II, Section I of the Title I Project Proposal in Appendix E.

CHAPTER IV

DETERMINATION OF ELIGIBLE ATTENDANCE

AND PROJECT AREAS

Each district is free to use whatever method of showing its eligibility that works for that district. Free and reduced lunches is probably the easiest way to determine the number of children who come from low income families which is the basis for eligibility for Title I funds. This is the basis for determining eligibility for the schools in the Pittsfield District.

The enrollment for each attendance center was taken from the central office. The number of children that were receiving free or reduced lunches in each attendance center was obtained by letter from the principals of the centers. Since the lunch program is sponsored by the local Parent Teacher Associations, this information was not available in the central office.

The next step was to determine the percent of the children from low income families that reside in the district. The percent for the entire district then becomes the percent that each school must equal or exceed in order to qualify for Title I funds. The next step was to determine the percent of the children from low income families for each attendance center. All of the schools in the district qualify except Pittsfield High School. (See Part I, Section I of the Title I Project Proposal in Appendix E.)

CHAPTER V

EVALUATION

In the process of collecting data more information was gained than was necessary for the needs assessment. This information could be used to alter or expand current programs and might be the basis for developing some plans for the district.

In the collection of test data the achievement of students in grade one for mathematics was omitted. This was done primarily due to the fact that students enter the mathematics program in grade two instead of grade one. Later consideration indicated that it should have been included since these students will be in grade two during the year that this proposal covers. However, the opportunity to get these test scores did not arise. For practical purposes teacher evaluations at this level are given more consideration than test scores, at least by the teachers.

There was only a partial response to the teacher survey from three schools. The complete or almost complete lack of response from teachers in some grades resulted in a lack of data for comparison and less than accurate results for the needs assessment. The inclusion of spaces for teacher evaluation of self-concepts and attitudes toward school may have caused some reluctance on the part of some teachers to respond.

Working through the statistics in Part I was primarily knowing where to get the information and what to do with it. Changes in enrollment can complicate the process of determining the qual-

ifications of attendance centers for Title I funds. The budget is based on information from the last two or three years and expected expenditures.

A very essential part of the field experience was presenting the program for the final meeting of the Parent Advisory Council. Although some difficulty was experienced in preparing a slide presentation, the results of the effort were well received. The Title I Project Proposal for the 1978-79 school year was presented and discussed.

APPENDIX A

RESULTS

OF

ACHIEVEMENT TESTS

Table 6

READING

Metropolitan Readiness Tests

Spring 1977

Prereading
skills composite

Schools

Grade 1	Baylis	Milton	Nebo	Pearl	East	Total
High Stanines 7-9		21	3	1	27	32
Average Stanines 4-6	4	24	8	8	74	98
Low Stanines 1-3	2	3	2	3	4	14
Total	6	28	13	12	105	144

SRA Achievement Tests

Spring 1977

Grade and
Achievement

Schools

Grade 2	Baylis	Milton	Nebo	Pearl	South	Total
At or above grade level	12	14	6	3	78 2	113
.5 grade below level	1	2	4	3	22	32
1.0 below	3	2	5 1	8	18 1	36
Total	16	18	15	14	118	181
Grade 3						
At or above grade level	10	14	9	3	65	101
.5 grade below level	4	3	4	2	13 5	26
1.0 below			1 1		4 1	5
1.5 below				2		2
2.0 below				3		3
Total	14	17	14	10	82	137

 - EH and LD students

READING continued

Grade and achievement	Schools					Total
	Baylis	Milton	Nebo	Pearl	South	
Grade 4						
At or above grade level	6	13	9	2	65 <input type="checkbox"/>	95
.5 below grade level	2	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	2	13	21
1.0 below	1	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	1	8 <input type="checkbox"/>	15
1.5 below	2	1				3
2.0 below	2	1				3
2.0+ below				1	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3
Total	13	20	13	6	88	140
Grade 5					Higbee	
At or above grade level	4	10	2	3	59	78
.5 grade below level	1		3	2	10 <input type="checkbox"/>	16
1.0 below	2	1			6	9
1.5 below	1	1	2	1	5 <input type="checkbox"/>	10
2.0 below		2 <input type="checkbox"/>	1	1	2	6
2.0+ below	1		5 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	10
Total	9	14	13	10	83	129
Grade 6						
At or above grade level	3	10	3	1	62	79
.5 grade below level			3		10	13
1.0 below	2	2	2	1	7	14

☐- LD and EH students

READING Continued

Grade and Achievement

Schools

Grade 6	Baylis	Milton	Nebo	Pearl	Higbee	Total
1.5 below	1	2	1		8 3	12
2.0 below			1	1	3 1	6
2.0 ⁺ below	2	3 1	5	8	11 2	29
Total	8	17	15	11	102	153

Grade 7

At or above grade level	8	5	6	2	38	59
.5 grade below level	4	1	1	2	11	19
1.0 below	3	2	3		8	16
1.5 below		6	1		6 1	13
2.0 below	3	4			6	13
2.0 ⁺ below		6 3	1	6 2	14 3	29
Total	18	24	12	12	83	149

Grade 8

At or above grade level	6	8	5	1	68	88
.5 grade below level	1	4			12	17
1.0 below	4	1	1	2	8 1	16
1.5 below	1		3		4	8
2.0 below		2	2		2	6
2.0 ⁺ below	2	3	4		12 2	21
Total	14	18	15	3	106	156

 - LD or EH

Table 7

MATHEMATICS

SRA Achievement Tests

Spring 1977

Grade and Placement	Schools					
Grade 2	Baylis	Milton	Nebo	Pearl	South	Total
At or above grade level	11	7	11	4	83	116
.5 grade below level	5	5	3	7	30	50
1.0 below		6	1	3	4	14
1.5 below						
Total	16	18	15	14	117	180
Grade 3						
At or above grade level	11	15	9	4	62	101
.5 grade below level	3	1	4	3	13	24
1.0 below			1	2	3	6
1.5 below		1		1	1	3
2.0 below						
Total	14	17	24	10	79	133
Grade 4						
At or above grade level	9	12	7	2	59	89
.5 grade below level	2	4	3	1	16	26
1.0 below	2	2	1	2	9	16
1.5 below			1		1	2
2.0 below				1		1
2.0 ⁺ below		1				1
Total	13	19	12	6	85	135

MATHEMATICS Continued

Grade and Placement	Schools					
Grade 5	Baylis	Milton	Nebo	Pearl	Higbee	Total
At or above grade level	4	8	2	1	72	87
.5 grade below level		1	1	1	6	9
1.0 below	2	2	5	2	5	16
1.5 below	2	2	2	2		8
2.0 below		1	2	1		4
2.0 ⁺ below	1		1	3		5
Total	9	14	13	10	83	129
Grade 6						
At or above grade level	2	9	3	1	46	61
.5 grade below level	2	3	3		18	26
1.0 below	1	3	2	1	19	26
1.5 below		1	3		8	12
2.0 below	1	1	1	2	7	12
2.0 ⁺ below	2		3	7	5	17
Total	8	17	15	11	103	154
Grade 7						
At or above grade level	8		3	1	38	50
.5 grade below level			2		14	16
1.0 below	3	3			7	13
1.5 below	4	2	2		6	14

MATHEMATICS continued

Grade and Placement	Schools					
Grade 7	Baylis	Milton	Nebo	Pearl	Higbee	Total
2.0 below	2	2	3	2	6	15
2.0+ below	1	17	2	9	11	40
Total	18	24	12	12	82	148
Grade 8						
At or above grade level	2	5	2		40	49
.5 grade below level			1		17	18
1.0 below	3		1	1	17	22
1.5 below	2	4	3		11	20
2.0 below	2	2	3		8	15
2.0+ below	5	7	5	2	13	32
Total	14	18	15	3	106	156

APPENDIX B

TEACHER SURVEY FORM

Teachers.

I am doing a needs assessment for Title I for Mr. Scranton as part of the requirements for a college course.

I have the results from last spring's achievement tests. I also need your evaluation of your students. Please complete the teacher survey form and return it to the Title I teacher in your building within two weeks. If you teach two grades, please complete one form for each grade. If there is more than one section for each grade, you may complete a form for each room.

Thank you for your cooperation.

TEACHER SURVEY

Grade _____ School _____

1. Total number of students _____

2. Reading	1	2	3	4
At or above grade level	_____	_____	_____	_____
.5 grade below grade level	_____	_____	_____	_____
1.0 grade below grade level	_____	_____	_____	_____
1.5 grades below grade level	_____	_____	_____	_____
2.0 grades below grade level	_____	_____	_____	_____
2.0 grades below grade level	_____	_____	_____	_____

3. Mathematics				
At or above grade level	_____	_____	_____	_____
.5 grade below grade level	_____	_____	_____	_____
1.0 grade below grade level	_____	_____	_____	_____
1.5 grades below grade level	_____	_____	_____	_____
2.0 grades below grade level	_____	_____	_____	_____
2.0 grades below grade level	_____	_____	_____	_____

Column 1 -- Enter the number of students in each category.

Column 2 -- Enter the number of students in each category that have poor self-concepts.

Column 3 -- Enter the number of students in each category that have poor attitudes toward school.

Column 4 -- Enter the number of students in each category who are in LD or EH classes.

APPENDIX C
RESULTS
OF
THE TEACHER SURVEY

Table 8
READING (TEACHER SURVEY)

Grade and Achievement	Schools					
	Baylis	Milton	Nebo	rearl	east	Total
Grade 1						
At or above grade level	6 $\textcircled{1}\Delta$	10 $\textcircled{1}\Delta$	8	4 $\textcircled{1}$	55 $\textcircled{5}\Delta$	83
.5 grade below level	2	5 $\textcircled{1}$	1	3	19 $\textcircled{7}\Delta\textcircled{1}$	30
1.0 below	2 $\textcircled{2}$	1 $\textcircled{1}\Delta$	3 $\textcircled{1}\textcircled{3}$	1 Δ	6 $\textcircled{4}\Delta$	13
1.5 below		4 $\textcircled{4}\Delta$	2 $\textcircled{1}\textcircled{2}$			6
Total	10	20	14	8	80	132
Grade 2					South	
At or above grade level	5	11	9 $\textcircled{1}\textcircled{1}$	5	33 $\textcircled{2}\Delta$	63
.5 below	3 $\textcircled{1}\Delta\textcircled{2}$	7 $\textcircled{3}\Delta$	5 $\textcircled{2}\textcircled{1}$	6 $\textcircled{1}\Delta$	21 $\textcircled{5}\Delta\textcircled{1}$	42
1.0 below	2 $\textcircled{1}\textcircled{1}$		1	1	17 $\textcircled{4}\Delta\textcircled{3}$	21
1.5 below					1	1
2.0 below						
Total	10	18	15	12	72	127
Grade 3						
At or above grade level	6 Δ	13	8	3	45 $\textcircled{1}$	75
.5 below	6 $\textcircled{1}\Delta\textcircled{2}$	12	3 $\textcircled{1}$		20 $\textcircled{3}\textcircled{2}$	31
1.0 below	1	2 $\Delta\textcircled{1}$			8 $\textcircled{4}\Delta\textcircled{3}$	11
1.5 below	2					2
2.0 below				1 $\textcircled{1}$		1
2.0+ below				2 $\textcircled{2}$		2
Total	15	17	11	6	73	122

\textcircled{O} - poor self concept, Δ - poor attitude toward school
 $\textcircled{1}$ - LD or EH students

READING (TEACHER SURVEY) continued

Grade and placement	Schools					
Grade 4	Baylis	Milton	Nebo	Rearl	South	Total
At or above grade level	5 Δ	17 \square	9 Δ \square	3		34
.5 below level	4 Δ		1 \square	1		6
1.0 below	2 Δ	2 \square	1 \square	3 \square		8
1.5 below		1				1
2.0 below						
2.0+ below						
Total	11	20	11	7		49

Grade 5						Higbee
At or above grade level	3	14 Δ	4	2	47 Δ	70
.5 grade below level	1		5		5 Δ	11
1.0 below	2 Δ	1		3 Δ	5 Δ \square	11
1.5 below	1		3 Δ \square \square	1	2 \square	7
2.0 below				2 Δ \square		2
2.0+ below	1 \square				1 Δ \square	2
Total	8	15	12	8	60	103

Grade 6						
At or above grade level	3	10	7	2	75 Δ \square	97
.5 grade below level	2	2	4		20 Δ \square	28
1.0 below			3	1	8 Δ \square	12

0 - poor self-concept

Δ - poor attitude toward school

\square - poor or EH students

READING (TEACHER SURVEY) continued

Grade and
placement

Schools

Grade 6	Baylis	Milton	Nebo	Pearl	Higbee	Total
1.5 below	1 (1)			3 (1) (1)		4
2.0 below		1 (1)		2		3
2.0+ below				4 (1) (1)		4
Total	6	13	14	12	103	148

Grade 7

At or above grade level	9 (2) (1)	6	7	3	43 (6) (4)	75
.5 grade below level	2	1	1	2 (1)	16 (3) (3)	22
1.0 below		6	3	2 (1) (1)	110 (5) (4)	21
1.5 below	1 (1)	3	1		1 (1)	6
2.0 below		5 (2) (3)	1 (1) (1)	2 (2)	4 (4) (4)	12
2.0+ below		4 (2) (1) (3)		2 (2) (2)		6
Total	12	25	13	11	81	142

Grade 8

At or above grade level	4 (1)	9 (2) (2)	5	4	71 (6) (6)	93
.5 grade below level		4 (2) (1)	1		6 (1)	11
1.0 below	6	2 (1) (2)	2	1 (1)	9 (1) (3)	20
1.5 below	2 (1) (1)	1	1		3 (1) (1)	7
2.0 below			11		11 (3) (2)	12
2.0+ below	1	2 (1)	1		2	6
Total	13	18	11	5	102	149

key ○ - poor self-concept, △ - poor attitude toward school,
□ - LD or EH

Table 9
MATHEMATICS
Teacher Survey

Grade and Achievement	Schools					
Grade 1	Baylis	Milton	Nebo	Pearl	East	Total
At or above grade level	7	10	8	4	38	67
.5 grade below level	1	4		4	9	18
1.0 below	2	1	4		4	11
2.0 below						
2.0 ⁺ below		5				5
Total	10	20	12	8	51	101
Grade 2						
At or above grade level	8	15	11	8	58	100
.5 grade below level	2	2	4	3	14	25
1.0 below		1		1		2
1.5 below						
Total	10	18	15	12	72	127
Grade 3						
At or above grade level	7	16	9	3	33	68
.5 grade below level	5		1		7	13
1.0 below	2	1	1		2	6
1.5 below					1	1
2.0 below				1		1
2.0 ⁺ below				2		2
Total	14	17	11	6	43	91

MATHEMATICS continued

Grade and Achievement	Schools					
Grade 4	Baylis	Milton	Nebo	rearl	South	Total
At or above grade level	6	17	6	3		32
.5 grade below level	3	3	1	1		8
1.0 below	2		4	3		9
1.5 below						
total	11	20	11	7		49
Grade 5					Higbee	
At or above grade level	8	12	3	3	48	74
.5 grade below	2	2			6	10
1.0 below	3	1	6	2	5	17
1.5 below	3		3	1		7
2.0 below	2			2		4
2.0 ⁺ below						
total	18	15	12	8	59	112
Grade 6						
At or above grade level	3	8	4	2		17
.5 grade below level	3	4	5			12
1.0 below			5	2		7
1.5 below				3		3
2.0 below		1		1		2
2.0 ⁺ below				4		4

MATHEMATICS Continued

Grade and Achievement	Schools					
Grade 6	Baylis	Milton	Nebo	Pearl	Higbee	Total
Total	6	13	14	12		45
Grade 7						
At or above grade level	8	2	2	3		15
.5 grade below level	2	3	1			6
1.0 below	3	5	4	2		14
1.5 below	3	3	2	2		10
2.0 below	2	6	1	2		11
2.0+ below		6	1	2		9
Total	18	25	11	11		65
Grade 8						
At or above grade level	2	14	2	3		21
.5 grade below level	3		1	1		5
1.0 below	2	3	4	1		10
1.5 below	3		2			5
2.0 below			1			1
2.0+ below	3	1	1			5
Total	13	18	11	5		47

APPENDIX D
DISTRICTWIDE RESULTS
OF
TESTS AND SURVEY

READING DISTRICTWIDE

Grade Placement	At or above grade level		.5 grade below level		1.0 grade below level	
	Tests	Survey	Tests	Survey	Tests	Survey
1	32	83 <u>7</u> <u>2</u> <u>2</u>	98	30 <u>3</u> <u>3</u> <u>1</u>	14	13 <u>8</u> <u>3</u> <u>3</u>
2	133 <u>2</u>	63 <u>4</u> <u>4</u> <u>1</u>	32	42 <u>12</u> <u>7</u> <u>4</u>	36 <u>2</u>	21 <u>5</u> <u>5</u> <u>3</u>
3	101	75 <u>1</u> <u>1</u>	26 <u>5</u>	31 <u>3</u> <u>2</u> <u>5</u>	5 <u>2</u>	11 <u>5</u> <u>5</u> <u>3</u>
4	95 <u>1</u>	34 <u>1</u> <u>2</u> <u>2</u>	21 <u>2</u>	6 <u>1</u> <u>1</u>	14 <u>5</u>	8 <u>1</u> <u>4</u>
5	78	70 <u>5</u>	16 <u>2</u>	11 <u>1</u>	19	11 <u>2</u> <u>3</u>
6	79	97 <u>9</u> <u>1</u> <u>1</u>	13	28 <u>8</u> <u>9</u>	14	12 <u>2</u> <u>3</u>
7	59	75 <u>8</u> <u>5</u>	19	22 <u>3</u> <u>▲</u>	16	21 <u>6</u> <u>5</u>
8	88	93 <u>5</u> <u>9</u>	17	11 <u>3</u> <u>1</u>	16 <u>1</u>	20 <u>2</u> <u>6</u>

Grade Placement	1.5 grades below level		2.0 grades below level		2.0+ grades below level	
	Tests	Survey	Tests	Survey	Tests	Survey
1		6 <u>5</u> <u>3</u>				
2		1				
3	2	2	3	1		2
4	3	1	3		2	
5	10 <u>1</u>	7 <u>1</u> <u>1</u> <u>5</u>	6 <u>1</u>	2 <u>1</u> <u>1</u>	10 <u>6</u>	2 <u>1</u> <u>2</u>
6	12 <u>3</u>	4 <u>2</u> <u>1</u>	6 <u>1</u>	3 <u>1</u>	29 <u>3</u>	4 <u>1</u> <u>1</u>
7	13 <u>1</u>	6 <u>3</u>	13	12 <u>8</u> <u>8</u> <u>3</u>	29 <u>8</u>	6 <u>4</u> <u>3</u> <u>3</u>
8	8	7 <u>3</u> <u>1</u> <u>1</u>	6	12 <u>3</u> <u>2</u>	21 <u>2</u>	6 <u>1</u>

MATHEMATICS DISTRICTWIDE

Grade Placement	At or above grade level		.5 grade below level		1.0 grade below level	
	Tests	Survey	Tests	Survey	Tests	Survey
1		67		18		11
2	116	100	50	25	14	2
3	101	68	24	13	6	6
4	89	32	26	8	16	9
5	87	74	9	10	16	17
6	61	17	26	12	26	7
7	50	15	16	6	13	14
8	49	21	18	5	22	10

Grade Placement	1.5 grades below level		2.0 grades below level		2.0+ grades below level	
	Tests	Survey	Tests	Survey	Tests	Survey
1						5
2						
3	3	1		1		2
4	2		1		1	
5	8	7	4	4	5	
6	12	3	12	2	17	4
7	14	10	15	11	40	9
8	20	5	15	1	32	5

APPENDIX E

TITLE I

PROJECT PROPOSAL

IOE, TITLE I USE ONLY
ECT NUMBER

ER UPON WHICH GRANT IS
MINED

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
ILLINOIS OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Compensatory Education
Title I, Public Law 93-380
100 North First Street
Springfield, Illinois 62777

FY 1979 APPLICATION FOR GRANT
TO MEET THE SPECIAL EDUCATIONAL NEEDS
OF EDUCATIONALLY DEPRIVED CHILDREN

LOCATION

COUNTY

Pike
DISTRICT NAME

Pittsfield C.U. District

DISTRICT NUMBER

10

ACTIONS: Please consult Filing Date Schedule for due dates of this form.

ete six copies, retain the gold copy as school work copy. Sub-
her five copies to Regional Superintendent who will sign and
d each copy to State Title I Office. Approved copies will be
uted as follows:

WHITE	- IOE (Project File)
BLUE	- IOE (Finance)
YELLOW	- IOE (Regional File)
GREEN	- Approved copy will be returned to applicant school.
PINK	- Approved copy will be returned to Regional Superintendent
GOLD	- Work Copy

Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (as amended) provides Federal funds for compensatory
tional programs for students living in areas with a high concentration of low-income families. The basic aim of this legislation is
vide improved educational opportunities for educationally deprived children.

Districts wishing to implement projects must, in accordance with existing Federal and State guidelines, identify attendance areas
served, determine the unmet educational needs of children living in these areas, plan instructional and service activities to meet
needs, and make application to the State for project approval and funding. If approved, districts must then implement their
cts, maintain fiscal records, evaluate results, and report on the outcomes of their project activities.

- Before completing this application please review Federal Register, September 28, 1976.

Application is being submitted for a project planned to begin on August 1, 19 78 and end on
July 31, 19 79

Project cannot begin until above date. State Education Agency approval date is required before preservice, purchase of equipment, etc.

DISTRICT (Legal Name and District Number)

Pittsfield Community Unit District #10

PHONE

SS

E. Washington Street/Pittsfield, IL 62363

OF CHIEF SCHOOL OFFICER

ard F. Seymour

PHONE

217/285-2464

SS

E. Washington Street/Pittsfield, IL 62363

AND TITLE OF CONTACT PERSON OR TITLE I DIRECTOR

bert Scranton, Title I Director

PHONE

217/285-4151

SS

W. Adams Street/Pittsfield, IL 62363

EL TERM TO BE COVERED BY THIS APPLICATION (Check one)

Regular School Term Only

☐

Summer Term Only

☐

Regular and Summer Terms

YES

☒

NO

IS THIS A COOPERATIVE PROJECT?

If "Yes", attach "CERTIFICATE FOR PARTICIPATION IN COOPERATIVE PROJECT" Form IOE 20-21 to front of
Application.

OF PROJECT

ling and Mathematics

FINANCE OF FISCAL EFFORT (Federal Register, September 28, 1976, Section 116.19)

verage per pupil expenditure from State and Local funds for Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 1977

\$ 1,428.00

verage per pupil expenditure from State and Local funds for Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 1978

\$ 1,530.00

B, is 5% less than A, please attach explanation.)

Part I - Statistical Data

UNIT 1 - DETERMINATION OF ELIGIBLE ATTENDANCE AND PROJECT AREAS (Federal Register, Section 116a.20)

SOURCE(S) OF DOCUMENTED DATA FOR DETERMINING THE NUMBER OF CHILDREN FROM LOW INCOME FAMILIES.
 Attach explanation for any data listed not self explanatory)

SOURCE	DATE	C. SOURCE	DATE
Free and reduced lunches (letter)			
SOURCE	DATE	D. SOURCE	DATE

METHOD OF QUALIFYING ATTENDANCE AREAS

☒ Percentages ☐ Numbers ☐ Both

A. PUBLIC SCHOOL ATTENDANCE AREAS

LIST ALL ATTENDANCE AREAS IN DISTRICT IN DESCENDING RANK AS PER COLUMN 6 or 7	GRADES SERVED	NUMBER OF ATTENDANCE AREAS	TOTAL NO. OF CHILDREN ENROLLED IN EACH ATTENDANCE CENTER LISTED IN COLUMN(1)	NUMBER OF CHILDREN RESIDING IN ATTENDANCE AREAS (Include private school children, dropouts where applicable)			ESTIMATED NO. OF CHILDREN WHO WILL PARTICIPATE IN ACTIVITIES FROM ATTENDANCE CENTERS LISTED IN COLUMN (1)		
				TOTAL	FROM LOW-INCOME FAMILIES	PER CENT (Cols. 6 ÷ 5)	FROM PUBLIC SCHOOLS	FROM PRIVATE SCHOOLS	TOTAL (Cols. 8 + 9)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
earl	K-8	1	90	90	32	36	29	0	29
aylis	K-8	1	99	99	32	32	28	0	28
ast	K-1	1	129	129	33	26	34	0	34
lton	1-12	1	244	247	55	22	26	0	26
bo	K-8	1	109	109	22	20	31	0	31
gbee	5-8	1	407	407	78	19	51	0	51
uth	K, 2-4	1	352	352	66	19	52	0	52
tttsfield High School	9-12	1	544	563	56	10	0	0	0
for unit 10 TOTALS		8	1974	1996	374	19	251	0	251

1 District-Wide Percentage
 (Totals = Col. 6 ÷ Col. 5) 18.73 %

2 Average Number Per Attendance Center
 (Totals = Col. 6 ÷ Col. 3) 46.75

B. PRIVATE SCHOOLS WITH CHILDREN RESIDING IN DISTRICT

NAME OF PRIVATE SCHOOL (1)	GRADES SERVED (2)	TOTAL NUMBER OF CHILDREN ENROLLED IN EACH SCHOOL LISTED IN Col. 1 (3)	NUMBER OF CHILDREN WHO RESIDE IN APPLICANT SCHOOL DIST. (4)	NUMBER OF CHILDREN ENROLLED WHO LIVE IN PROJECT ATTENDANCE AREAS (5)	NUMBER OF CHILDREN PARTICIPATING IN PROJECT (6)
N / A					
TOTALS					

If District is grouping schools as per grade levels (elem., jr. high, sr. high), this page must be completed separately for each group (Federal Register, Section 116a.20(b)(5)). Provide attachments if more lines are needed.

\$	Current Funds Available
\$	Carryover Funds
\$	Current Funds
\$	

☐ Budget Summary Amendment

BUDGET SUMMARY AND PAYMENT SCHEDULE Title I, ESEA

SECTION II - BUDGET

CODE (Region-County-District)		EDUCATIONAL SERVICE REGION		DISTRICT NAME		DISTRICT NUMBER	
63-075-0100-26		63 Pike		Pittsfield Community Unit School		10	
ACCT. NO. (1)	EXPENDITURE ACCOUNTS (2)	BUDGET SUMMARY			PAYMENT SCHEDULE		
		SALARIES (3)	CONTRACT AND OTHER (4)	TOTAL (5)	PAYMENT MONTH(S)	REQUEST	— Office Use Only —
INSTRUCTION 100	A Salaries for Instruction	72,729.13		72,729.13	1 July and August	\$ 2,000.00 (81)	
	B Textbooks				2 September	10,561.77 (82)	
	C Instructional Materials				3 October	9,661.73 (83)	
	D Title I Reference Books (needed in program)				4 November	9,661.73 (84)	
	E Instructional Equipment (other than audiovisual)				5 December	9,661.73 (85)	
	F Teaching Supplies and all other expenses for instruction		13,217.49	13,217.49	6 January	9,661.73 (86)	
	211 Attendance Services				7 February	9,661.73 (87)	
	212 Guidance Services				8 March	9,661.73 (88)	
	213 Health Services				9 April	9,661.73 (89)	
	214 Psychological Services				10 May	9,661.73 (90)	
MEDIA SERVICES 222	215 Speech and Audio Pathology Services				11 June	3,150.92 (91)	
	221 Improvement of Instruction		1,000.00	1,000.00	12 July and August	6,301.84 (92)	
	A Library Resources						
	B Audiovisual Equipment						
	C Audiovisual Materials						
	230 General Administration	9,244.00	1,917.75	11,161.75			
	240 School Administration						
	253 Construction and Remodeling						
	254 Operation and Maintenance	250.00	850.00	1,100.00			
	255 Pupil Transportation						
256 Food Services	256 Food Services						
	290 Supporting Services - Other						
	300 Community Services		100.00	100.00			
	410 Diffusion - Title IV, Part C						
	25 Total Direct Costs	\$ 82,223.13	\$ 17,085.24	\$ 99,308.37			
26 Approved Indirect Costs (Cost Rates - IOE 50-04 or 50-35)		%	\$	TOTAL	\$ 99,308.37		
27 TOTAL PROJECT BUDGET			\$ 99,308.37				

SECTION III - PROJECT STAFF

CAPITAL OUTLAY (if any)

Identify all items of equipment included in the Title I budget and explain why they are necessary to implement this program. Request for equipment and other types of capital expenditures must be included in the budget and available from the local educational agency or state or federal sources. Title I equipment on hand and close the budget is being used for the purpose it is intended.

None

BUDGET BREAKDOWN

Explain each expenditure, in order, as account numbers and line totals appear on page 31. Attach additional pages as needed.

See Attachment

PROJECT STAFF

STAFF ACTIVITIES		ESTIMATED NUMBER OF STAFF ASSIGNMENTS AND SALARIES INCLUDED IN TITLE I BUDGET				NUMBER OF OTHER STAFF ASSIGNMENTS (Not included in Title I Budget)	
		REGULAR TERM		SUMMER TERM			TOTAL SALARIES
CLASSIFICATION OF ASSIGNMENTS (1)		Total No. of Personnel (2)	Full-Time Equivalent (3)	Total No. of Personnel (4)	Full-Time Equivalent (5)	(6)	
Teaching - Preschool	01					\$	
Teaching - Kindergarten	01						
Teaching - Elementary	01	7.5	5.57			65,969.76	
Teaching - Secondary	01	.5	.50			6,759.37	
Teacher Aide	02						
Librarian	03						
Librarian Aide							
Supervision	04						
Direction and Management (Admin.)	07	1.0	.30			6,237.00	
Counseling	15						
Psychologist	16						
Testing	17						
Social Work	18						
Attendance	19						
Nurse	20						
Physician	21						
Dentist	22						
Dental Hygienist	23						
Clerical	10	1.0	.50			3,007.00	
Other (Specify Assignment and No.)		1.0	.10			250.00	
Total Number of Assignments, FTE, and Salaries (Sum of lines 1 through 20)		11.0	6.97			\$82,223.13	
		PARENTS		OTHER ADULTS		YOUTH	TOTAL
Number of Volunteers to be Assigned to this Project		24		0			24
		TEACHERS		TEACHER AIDES		OTHER	TOTAL
Number of Title I Staff to Receive Inservice Training		8				12	20

STAFF JOB DESCRIPTIONS

Provide job descriptions for all personnel receiving Title I funds. Job descriptions for part-time Title I persons must include their functions other than Title I.

The Assistant Superintendent will spend at least 30% of his time writing the project, purchasing materials, supervising teachers, coordinating the program and organizing the in-service program.

The Assistant Superintendent's secretary will spend 50% of the time typing, duplicating materials, and other duties related to Title I.

4. STAFF JOB DESCRIPTIONS

Title I teachers work with Title I 100% of the time they are employed by the district except the Pearl Title I teacher. She spends 35.7% of her time with kindergarten students in our regular kindergarten program.

Each Title I teacher is responsible for testing, screening, and placement of students in the Title I program. Throughout the school year, each teacher works with Title I students for approximately thirty-minute periods five days a week when possible class sizes range upward to a maximum of six. Also, the staff under the direction of the Title I Director must develop a program that corelates with the regular program within the school system. Furthermore, the Title I teacher must complete required forms for the proper functioning of the Title I Project.

PARTICIPANTS

ESTIMATED NUMBER OF PARTICIPATING CHILDREN BY GRADE LEVEL AND TYPE OF SCHOOL

GRADE LEVEL (1)	NUMBER ENROLLED in public schools			NUMBER ENROLLED in private schools			TOTAL UNDELETED COUNT (8)
	From Public Schools (2)	From Private Schools (3)	Total (4)	From Public Schools (5)	From Private Schools (6)	Total (7)	
Preschool							
Kindergarten							
Grade 1	50		50				50
Grade 2	53		53				53
Grade 3	57		57				57
Grade 4	35		35				35
Grade 5	25		25				25
Grade 6	25		25				25
Grade 7	12		12				12
Grade 8	6		6				6
Grade 9	6		6				6
Grade 10	7		7				7
Grade 11	4		4				4
Grade 12	3		3				3
TOTAL (Sum of 1 through 14):	283		283				283
ESTIMATED NUMBER OF DROPOUTS WHO ARE INCLUDED IN ITEM 5A ABOVE							

INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES TO BE FUNDED UNDER TITLE I

INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES (1)	ESTIMATE NUMBER OF CHILDREN WHO WILL PARTICIPATE IN INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES LISTED IN COL. 1 - Include both Public & Private (2)	COST OF EACH INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITY		
		Regular Term (3)	Summer Term (4)	Total (5)
English	21	9,034.26		9,034.26
Reading and Other Language Arts	200	57,205.58		57,205.58
Mathematics	100	33,068.53		33,068.53
Special Activities for the Handicapped				
Other Direct Educative Services				
Attendance Social Worker, Guidance and Psychology				
Health and Nutrition				
Staff Development				
Other Supporting Services				
TOTALS	321	\$99,308.37		\$99,308.37

Part II -- Program Plan for FY 1979

SECTION I -- NEEDS ASSESSMENT (Federal Register, Section 116a 21)

DETERMINATION OF THE NEEDS OF ALL CHILDREN RESIDING IN ELIGIBLE ATTENDANCE AREAS

Describe the basic needs of each of the listed groups of children living in eligible Title I areas for which you provide education or may provide Title I services, according to the grade grouping used in your school system. Indicate the sources of information, including specifically identified objective educational measurements and consultations with teachers, parents, and persons knowledgeable of the needs of the children who reside in the eligible attendance areas).

Also include, as a source, data from past evaluations of Title I projects. Documentation of this assessment must be maintained in district files. For Neglected and Delinquent programs - see special form from State Education Agency.

1. Preschool

The Four-Rivers Special Education Association does a developmental screening of our preschool district.

2. Early Elementary (grades K-3).

See Attachment

3. Later Elementary (grades 4-8).

See Attachment

4. Secondary (grades 9-12).

See Attachment

5. Other groups who may be served (dropouts, handicapped, non-English speaking, non-public school children).

N / A

If for any reason this project is not being designed to meet the highest ranking needs as listed (Section I, Part A) justification and rationale must be given.

The need is near equal in the reading and mathematics areas. Therefore, a near equal concentration of services will be provided for the students.

There appears to be a need for English services at the secondary level at Milton. Therefore, services will be provided for those students as well.

Describe any specific activities or services that may be available through other public and private agencies. Explain the arrangements for coordination with the Title I program. (Federal Register, Section 116.41).

N / A

Part II, Section I--NEEDS ASSESSMENT

2. Early Elementary Grades K-3

A teacher survey was conducted by this office to determine Title I needs for the 1978-79 school year. The survey indicates that 74 students were 6 months or more below grade level in reading in grades 1-3. The same survey indicates that 30 students were 6 months or more below grade level in mathematics.

Last year's achievement tests were used to determine the achievement level of the students. (This year's test results were not yet available.) Test results were used to determine the approximate level of the students at the beginning of the current school year. Readiness test results were used for first grade. Following are the results:

<u>Grade</u>	<u>Reading</u>		<u>Mathematics</u>	
	<u>Test</u>	<u>Survey</u>	<u>Test</u>	<u>Survey</u>
1	14	18		13
2	36	31	14	4
3	10	19	9	13

3. Later Elementary Grades 4-8

The teacher survey was conducted by this office to determine the Title I needs for the 1978-79 school year. The survey indicates that 106 students are 1 year or more below grade level in reading in grades 4-8. The same survey indicates that 152 students are 1 year or more below grade level in mathematics in grades 4-8.

Last year's achievement tests were used to determine the achievement level of the students. (This year's test results are not yet available.) Test results were used to determine the approximate level of the students at the beginning of the current school year. Following are the results:

<u>Grade</u>	<u>Reading</u>		<u>Mathematics</u>	
	<u>Test</u>	<u>Survey</u>	<u>Test</u>	<u>Survey</u>
4	1	29	4	0
5	26	14	17	13
6	27	11	41	31
7	55	25	38	72
8	35	27	67	36

Because nearly equal numbers of students are eligible for both reading and mathematics, nearly equal emphasis is placed on the two areas.

There are differences in the test results and the teacher survey. Both sources are considered when selecting children for the program.

3. cont.'

Furthermore, 64 students exhibited a poor attitude towards school and 58 students exhibited a poor self concept. This data was gathered from a teacher survey.

4. A survey of test data at the secondary level at the Milton attendance center yields the following information for English students.

<u>Grade</u>	<u>Total Students</u>	<u>No. 1 year or more below grade level</u>
9	26	9
10	38	18
11	21	9
12	28	12

With this need at the secondary level, services will be provided these students.

SELECTION CRITERIA (Federal Register, Section 116a.21(e))

List specific criteria for selection of participating children for each group to be served. Include names of any tests to be used, administration dates and qualifying scores.

☒ Indicate by checking the box that the evaluation pre-test scores will not be used to select participants for grades 2-12.

1. Preschool

2. Early Elementary

See Attachment

3. Later Elementary

4. Secondary English. The classroom teacher and guidance counselor refer the Title I teacher to the students so that the students might be screened. These students will be screened with a Metropolitan Achievement test, Advanced Level I, or Advanced Level II to determine if they are one year or more below grade level. Tests used: Metropolitan Achievement Test, Advanced Level I or II, copyright 1978.
5. Other groups who will be served (dropouts, handicapped, non-English speaking, private school children).

NEEDS OF PARTICIPATING CHILDREN

Describe procedures to be used to diagnose priority needs of children to be served. Specify how tests and other instruments will be used. (Federal Register, Section 116a.21(f))

The district is encouraged to develop for each child, a written, individualized educational plan agreed to jointly by the district, a parent or guardian of the child, and when appropriate, the child. (Federal Register, Section 116.47)

The procedures used to determine our priority needs are two:

1. A teacher survey instrument locally constructed in order to determine the number of students needing Title I services in the various target areas.
2. S.R.A. Achievement Tests given district wide during April. The results are just now arriving.

Upon examination of this data our priority needs are assessed.

It appears that there is close to an equal need between reading and mathematics. Therefore, we will attempt to split our time on a near equal basis.

PART II, SECTION I --NEEDS ASSESSMENT (D. Selection Criteria)

Reading

The following is a list of tests used in reading for both the early and later elementary grades:

Metropolitan Reading Readiness, 1974	Stanford Diagnostic, 1966
SRA Diagnostic Word Game, 1967	Botel Diagnostic, 1970
Slosson, 1963	Informal Reading Inventory
SRA Achievement, 1972	Gray Oral, 1963
Peabody, 1970	

The classroom teachers refer potential Title I students for testing. Upon referral, the Title I teacher gives a series of the above listed tests in order to determine if the student is in fact below grade level. In the early elementary, the student must be at least six months below grade level. In the later elementary program, the student must test approximately one year or more below grade level. Once it has been determined that the student is Title I qualified, the test data is used to determine scheduling as the basic needs of the student. Classes are usually limited to six or less students with classes meeting daily for a 25-30 minute period. In departmental situations, because of scheduling difficulties students meet two or three times per week for a 40-45 minute period.

Math

The following is a list of tests used in math for both the early and later elementary grades:

SRA Achievement, 1972	SRA Ability, 1972
Otis I. Q., 1969	Peabody, 1970
Placement exam McGraw/Hill, 1973	Slosson, 1963
Placement exam Self-Teaching Arithmetic, 1973	
Stanford Diagnostic, 1966	

The procedures used in mathematics are the same as those used in reading.

State specific objectives to be accomplished in this project as they relate to the priority needs to be served for each group in the Title I program. (For example, if the program involves reading, state specifically the gain in reading level hoped to be achieved.)

1. Preschool

See attachment

2. Early Elementary

See attachment

3. Later Elementary

See attachment

4. Secondary

5. Other groups who will be served (dropouts, handicapped, non English speaking, private school children).

N / A

SECTION II--MEASURABLE OBJECTIVES BASED ON ASSESSMENT OF NEED

2. Early Elementary (K-3)

- a. Each student will show an improvement in his self-image as measured by the observation of the Title I teacher and the classroom teachers.
- b. Each student will show significant improvement in his attitude towards school and community as measured by the Title I and classroom teachers' observations.
- c. Title I students in the reading and math programs will exhibit at least 1 NCE growth per year in the program as measured by the 1978 SRA Achievement test series.

3. Later Elementary

- a. Each student will show an improvement in his self-image as measured by the observation of the Title I teacher and the classroom teachers.
- b. Each student will show significant improvement in his attitude towards school and community as measured by the Title I and classroom teachers' observations.
- c. Title I students in the reading and math programs will exhibit at least 1 NCE growth per year in the program as measured by the 1978 SRA Achievement test series.

4. Secondary

- a. - c. Same as early grades in terms of attitude and self concept.
- d. Title I English students will make 1 NCE growth for each year in the program as measured by Level 18 of the California Achievement test, 1977.

SECTION III - PROJECT DESCRIPTION(S) *(Federal Register, Section 116a.22)*

Describe each instructional activity and any related supportive services for each group served. State anticipated class sizes and provide a schedule(s) which should include length of class periods, frequency of meetings and other pertinent information.

Preschool

Early Elementary

See Attachment

Later Elementary

See Attachment

Secondary

See Attachment

Other groups who will be served (dropouts, handicapped, non-English speaking, private school children, children in local institutions for neglected or delinquent children).

N / A

SECTION III--PROJECT DESCRIPTIONS

The students referred by the classroom teachers will be given a series of pre-tests which will help to determine if the student is eligible to be in the Title I program. The student is eligible to be in the Title I program if he is at least one full year behind in his achievement in reading. The exception to this criteria is at the first 2 & 3 grade levels. The first grade students are allowed to enter the program in January; however, they will not, in most cases, be one full year behind in reading readiness. The students are being continuously evaluated throughout the year. A student may reach a point where he has improved so much that both the Title I teacher and the regular classroom teacher feel he can be dropped from the program and to make any adjustments necessary. The schools in the reading program for the 1978-79 year will be Milton School (1-8), Pearl School (K-8), Higbee School (5-8), Baylis School (K-8), Nebo School (K-8), South School (K, 2-4). The East School (K-1) is involved during the second semester. The math position of the Title I program is patterned after the reading program such as referral, testing, and selection of students. The math program includes all schools except East School (K-1).

A diagnostic reading test is used at the first of the year to find out the strengths and weaknesses of each teacher-referred student. The student is given an achievement test. If there is a high correlation between the reading diagnostic test and the reading achievement scores, placement tests are not used. But if the correlation is questionable, additional tests are given. The scores of the student has to be such that the student's potential is one or more grade levels above his actual reading level.

The teacher takes into consideration the reading skill needs of the well-screened student. The teacher selects the kinds of reading materials needed. The re-teaching of the student may be done as a small group so that an individual student in Title I may later achieve the level of accomplishment as he goes slowly which allows this student to proceed into a more complex level in a specific reading skill. The alternative for some students who are having problems would be the use of different materials emphasizing the same skill and the same complexity level of that specific skill. The student may improve so much that he would be able to be dropped from the program.

Teacher class schedule:

8:30-12:00 1:00-3:30 - For a full-time teacher - Included in this schedule is a reasonable amount of recordkeeping time. Grades 2-8 will be for the complete school year and the first grade program will be for the last half of the year. Each period will be at least 25 minutes with, in most cases, 5 minutes between each period. There will be from 1 to as high as 6 in a class. Most classes will have 4 to 5 students. The math program is the same schedule as the reading program except for the first grade. The classes meet daily for most students.

ON IV - EVALUATION

MODEL A-1 PROGRAM IMPACT EVALUATION (Federal Register, Section 151(t); 116a.22(a)(5))

Describe the evaluation procedures that will be used to comply with the rules for implementing Model A-1. Note that Model A-1 covers only grades 2-12, regular term, and all-year-long programs.

Also note that evaluation pre-test scores may not be used for selection of participants.

Give the following information:

1. Complete name of the achievement test(s) to be used for pre- and post-testing.
 - a. **SRA Achievement Series**
 - 1978, Form 1
 - Norm Dates--October 1, 1978
 - April 15, 1979
2. Form(s) and level(s) of the test(s) listed above. (Note that the same form and level of the test must be administered at both pre- and post-testing).
 - a. **Form B--grade 2**
 - Form C--grade 3**
 - Form D--grade 4**
 - Form E--grades 5 & 6**
 - Form F--grade 7**
 - Form G--grade 8**
 - Form H--grades 9-12**
3. Dates for pre- and post-testing.
 - Pre-testing--October 3 & 4 (Make-up October 5 & 6)**
 - Post-testing--April 17 & 18 (Make-up April 19 & 20)**

INDIVIDUAL STUDENT EVALUATIONS (Federal Register, Section 116a.22(a)(1); 116a.22(b)(1); 116.43)

Describe the evaluation methods that will be used to measure individual student attainment of the objectives stated for each of the listed groups of children.

1. **Preschool**
2. **Early Elementary**
See Attachment
3. **Later Elementary**
See Attachment
4. **Secondary**
See Attachment
5. **Other groups who will be served (deaf/blind, handicapped, non English speaking, private school children, children in local institutions for neglected and delinquent children).**

SECTION IV--EVALUATION (B. Individual Student Evaluations)

The evaluation methods are the same for each grade level.

A & B Objectives - Measuring Method:

The teacher analyses the self-image and attitude of the student by talking with the students one by one. The teacher writes down the finding at the first part of the year and the self-image and attitude at the last part of the year. A comparison is made and it is in the vast majority of cases an improvement is shown.

C Objectives - Measuring Method:

The students are given achievement and/or diagnostic tests which indicate his potential and achievement levels at the beginning and end of the year. The difference is computed and the comparisons are made with past reading records. The comparisons show that the students in the Title I program do grow more in reading and/or math while in the Title I program than they did in other years in the regular classroom only.

D Objectives - Measuring Method:

The Title I students are evaluated by the regular classroom teacher as to, performance in the class. The students are evaluated as to how well they are coming along in class. The teachers are indicating a very positive response as to performance growth. The teachers are also very appreciative of the help in the presenting of reading and math to the students. The parents of the students are also helping us by giving information as to their feelings about the program by means of parent-teacher-director conferences or parent-teacher conferences. The parents give us their opinions as to the selection, procedures, and progress of the child.

SECTION V -- INSERVICE TRAINING *(Federal Register, Section 116.34, 116.36)*

Describe inservice training to be provided, including (1) purpose, (2) general organization, and (3) duration of the activities. If education aides are to be employed, describe the proposed program for their coordinated training with the professional staff they will assist.

Purpose in the past:

The in-service is to upgrade the Title I teacher and reading and math classroom teachers and to expose them to new methods, techniques and research in reading and math.

The in-service is designed to upgrade the Title I teachers by exposure to new methods, materials, techniques, and research in reading and math and to help the regular classroom teachers by showing them how to individualize their reading and/or math classes.

General Organization: The in-service training of the Title I teachers is done in two ways. One is to have in-service training outside of the district. The teacher's expenses are paid from the Title I funds.

(continued on page 11a)

SECTION VI -- DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION**DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION TO TITLE I AND REGULAR STAFF SERVING PARTICIPATING CHILDREN** *(Federal Register, Section 116.44)*

Describe methods to be used to make this information available including inservice education, professional workshops and seminars, consultations and visitations, and reports on the organization, operation and outcome of projects under Title I.

The Title I Director visits the teacher frequently and information is disseminated in this way.

The Title I teachers have meetings at different times during the year, as needed. We have a lengthy meeting before school starts each year in order to get ready for the coming school year.

DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION TO COMMUNITY *(Federal Register, Section 116.45)*

Describe ways in which information is to be made available to the local community and to the Parent Advisory Council. Documentation must be available for review.

Since we are a small community, communication is not much of a problem. The Title I director makes, or gives, several speeches and presentations each year on the procedure and purpose of the Title I Reading and Math programs. These are made to local club groups and PTA groups. The Title I teachers also make presentations to the PTA and club groups. The students and parents of students that are in the program also help to sing the praises of the Title I program. The local newspaper is an excellent source of dissemination of information. The school also has notices which go home to the parents. The Parent Advisory Council is made aware of the procedure, purpose, success, and failures of the Title I program by having meetings and notices sent to them.

SECTION V--INSERVICE TRAINING

The in-service training inside the district is carried out by a team effort. The workshops are designed to help new Title I teachers get started in the Title I program by showing them how to administer the tests and the use, value, and techniques used to present the materials to the students. There are workshops for all of the Title I teachers when new material and/or equipment are purchased.

The reading teachers in the district are also given reading and math workshops on how to work very closely with the Title I teachers. This cannot be done unless they are taught how to use certain types of materials and to individualize their instructions and learn how to identify the disadvantaged student. The workshops vary in length from one-half day to up to four days and involve from one to ten teachers in most cases. All substitutes are paid for from Title I funds.

Workshops for the reading teachers include presentation of various materials which will aid the classroom teacher in individualization.

The first meeting is one for general discussion and teacher's statements concerning their problems. The Title I program is explained as well as the process used for screening pupils. Students are referred by the teacher, then the Title I teacher checks the I.Q., finds the reading achievement, then determines the reading expectancy.

Tests vary with the levels of instruction and are followed by recording results on prescription sheets for individual instruction.

The SRA program can be initiated in the classroom with followups in the Title I program. (This is for primary and lower intermediate.) Word games are used of several kinds (vowel, diagraph, vocabulary building, etc.).

SECTION VII -- PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT *(Federal Register, Section 116a.25)*

Federal Regulations mandate that each district making application for a grant under Title I must have a district wide coordinating Parent Advisory Council (PAC) and one PAC for each school attendance area being served by a Title project. However, each district with only one project area school or with less than 1,000 total students enrolled in all project area schools may, after prior SEA approval, choose to have only a district wide PAC.

Each PAC must have, as a majority of its members, parents of children currently participating in or who will participate in a Title I Project.

INVOLVEMENT OF PAC IN PLANNING, IMPLEMENTATION, AND OPERATION OF THE TITLE I PROJECT

1. Date current Parent Advisory Councils (PAC's) were established November 9, 1977
2. Frequency of PAC meetings periodically as needed.

The following items must be checked for project approval. Documentation must be available for review.

3. Check each type of information and/or assistance furnished to the PAC's by the applicant district:

- ☒ a. Copies of the Title I Act, Federal and State regulations and guidelines.
- ☒ b. Copies of the district's current application.
- ☒ c. Progress reports of Title I projects.
- ☒ d. Orientation and training materials.
- ☒ e. Plans for future Title I projects.
- ☒ f. Needs assessment data for Title I projects.
- ☒ g. Evaluation results of prior Title I projects.
- ☒ h. Procedures for promptly responding to complaints and suggestions from parents.
- ☒ i. Funds provided to promote PAC activities
- ☐ j. Other (specify) _____

8. CERTIFICATION OF DISTRICT-WIDE COORDINATING PARENT ADVISORY COUNCIL CHAIRPERSON

As Parent Advisory Council Chairperson I certify that this council has served in an advisory capacity in those activities listed below and believe they have been conducted in accordance with Federal Regulations.

1. ☒ Selection of attendance centers.
2. ☒ Program planning and implementation.
3. ☒ Planning a continuing PAC role in Title I projects.
4. ☒ Obtaining program cooperation from local agencies.
5. ☒ Maintaining a PAC for each operating project building.

Date

Name of District-wide Coordinating Parent Advisory Council Chairperson

Date

Signature of District-wide Coordinating Parent Advisory Council Chairperson

SECTION VIII — PRIVATE SCHOOL PARTICIPATION (Federal Register, Section 116a.23)

Private schools may also be termed "Nonpublic" and may include Private, Parochial or Independent schools.

☐ Yes ☒ No Are there private school children residing in your district?

(If No, this section does not apply.)

Each district shall provide a genuine opportunity for participation in the Title I project to those educationally deprived children residing in its eligible attendance areas who are enrolled in private schools. If such children are enrolled in a private school located in another school district, the applicant may make arrangements for those children to be served by that district. If a private school chooses to have its educationally deprived children participate in a Title I project, then that private school must be involved in the project's planning and implementation.

As representative of a private school that will be participating in a Title I program, I certify that my private school has been involved with these following activities during planning of that program:

1. ☐ Helped identify private school children eligible for this program.
2. ☐ Contributed to an assessment of these children's special educational needs.
3. ☐ Suggested means to meet children's special educational needs.
4. ☐ Helped develop plans to serve private school children eligible for this program.
5. ☐ Made comments and recommendations when necessary.

Name of Private School

Address

Name and Title of Private School Representative

Date

Signature of Private School Representative

SECTION IX STATEMENT OF ASSURANCES AND CERTIFICATION

The applicant hereby assures the Illinois Office of Education that:

The control of funds provided under this Title, and title to property derived therefrom, shall be in a public agency for the uses and purposes provided in this Title, and that a public agency will administer such property and funds and apply them only for the purposes for which they are granted.

The applicant will make an annual report and such other reports to the State educational agency, in such form and containing such information, as may be reasonably necessary to enable the State educational agency to perform its duties under this Title, including information relating to the educational achievement of students participating in programs carried out under this Title, and will keep such records and afford such access thereto as the State educational agency may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

The Title I Activities conducted under this project during the regular school year in conjunction with regular school activities will be carried out in accordance with the applicable current court order of desegregation plan filed with the United States Office of Education (including modifications filed on Form HEW 441B), and all other Title I activities will be carried out on a non-discriminatory basis in accordance with the Regulations of the Department (45 CFR 80.3).

The following items must be checked for project approval.

- ☒ Right to privacy of student records has been observed. (Federal Regulations November, 1975)
- ☒ Title I salaries are comparable to salaries of other staff.
- ☒ All personnel are properly qualified.
- ☒ Title I staff has reviewed this application.

CERTIFICATION

The applicant designated below hereby applies for a grant of Federal funds to provide instructional activities and services to meet the special educational needs of educationally deprived children as set forth in this application.

WE HEREBY CERTIFY that, to the best of our knowledge, the information contained in this application is correct and documentation information contained in this application is on file in this school district; the agency named below has authorized us, as its representatives, to file this application; and such action is recorded in the minutes of the agency's meeting.

The Board of Education of Pittsfield Community Unit School District #10
Name of School District

has reviewed this project application on May 17, 1978 and has approved it for filing.
Date

Edward F. Seymour

Name of Administrator (Print or Type)

Name of Board Official (Print or Type)

Date

Signature of Administrator

Date

Signature of Board Official

REGIONAL SUPERINTENDENT

have reviewed this project application of the above named school district on _____ and recommend its filing as a high priority need.
Date

Eldon Atwood

Name of Regional Superintendent (Print or Type)

Signature of Regional Superintendent