1986

The Minimum Competency Testing Program of the Gary, Indiana Community School Corporation: A Case Study

William S. Demby
Loyola University Chicago

20

THE MINIMUM COMPETENCY TESTING PROGRAM OF THE GARY, INDIANA COMMUNITY SCHOOL CORPORATION: A CASE STUDY

by

William S. Demby, Jr.

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of the School of Education of Loyola University of Chicago in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Education

January

1986

DISSERTATION ABSTRACT

The Gary, Indiana Minimum Testing Program was started in February 1974. The goal of the MCT Program was to establish a minimum level at which a student was required to pass a competency examination in reading, mathematics, writing, and oral expression. This was to be an additional requirement for obtaining the high school diploma.

Testing for the program began during the school year 1976-1977. The first full complement of testing occurred in 1977-1978. The requirement for proficiency examinations as a requirement for graduation began on a graduated basis -- reading and mathematics in 1977, writing in 1978 and oral language in 1980.

The basic finding of this study is when remediation is begun early enough and performed under the proper circumstances, positive results may be expected. Even where ethnicity and indigency are prominent factors in a population, remediation may be used to offset the impact these factors have on student achievement.

This study revealed evidence which supports the conclusion that the MCT Program of the Gary Public Schools was successful in accomplishing its goal.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to thank Dr. Max A. Bailey, Director of his dissertation committee, for his advice and counsel, encouragement, and assistance throughout the preparation of this study.

He would also like to express his gratitude to Dr. Philip M. Carlin and Dr. Joan K. Smith for their assistance as members of the dissertation committee.

He wishes to thank Gary Public School administration and staff for their cooperation.

To Emma Jean Bakeman who typed and edited this manuscript, words cannot express the author's gratitude for the time she devoted to this effort.

To Dr. Joe L. Cain and Dr. Allene D. Gayles, a special thanks for their constructive criticism and support.

To his mother and father who through their love and kindness provided the atmosphere where achievement was always expected, the author owes a special debt of gratitude.

Finally, the author wishes to thank Constance Demby for her patience, support, and encouragement.

VITA

The author, William S. Demby, Jr., is the son of William and Melissa Demby. He was born February 5, 1933 in Clarksdale, Mississippi.

His elementary and secondary education was obtained in the public schools of vicksburg, Mississippi.

In September 1950 the author entered Alcorn State University, Lorman, Mississippi. In May 1954 he received the Bachelor of Science Degree in Biology.

In August 1969 the author was granted the opportunity to study in an EPDA Fellowship Program in Guidance for the Disadvantaged at Indiana State University, Terre Haute, Indiana. In August 1970 he received his Master of Science Degree in School Counseling.

The author is listed in the Indiana State Department of Public Instruction Publication, Successful Guidance Practices In The State of Indiana.

LIST OF TABLES

CONTENTS FOR APPENDIX

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

During the decade of the seventies the public dissatisfaction with the American public schools continued to escalate. Gary K. Hurt in the May 1978 issue of The Kappan pointed to the 1976 Gallup Poll of the "Public Attitude toward the Public Schools." "The poll indicated that a majority of those surveyed felt schools were not devoting enough attention to teaching basic skills."[1]

Public schools have increasingly been subjected to criticism by the American population in general. Specifically parents of many of these children, as well as persons in the business-industrial complex, indicate that graduates of public schools lack the basic skills to function properly in today's highly technical society. There has been some response to this discontent with the public schools. At this writing at least thirty-nine states have mandated specific competency standards with many local school districts instituting competency programs[2] for advancement in

---

[1] Gary Hurt, "The California Pupil Proficiency Law as Viewed by Its Author." The Kappan 59 (May 9, 1978): 592.

[2] Lucy M. Calkins, "'I Am One Who Writes' New Approaches to Children's Writing." American Educator, Fall, 1985, p. 26.

or graduation from high school. More recently, the Prestigious National Commission on Excellence in Education reported that "our Nation is at risk because of the rising tide of mediocrity which exists in our schools."[1] This has caused a flurry of new interest in minimum competency (MCT).

While agreeing with the assessment that many public school graduates are deficient in basic skill development. Gordon Cawelti stated:

> First of all, secondary schools are handling 90 percent of the school age population that would have been excluded thirty years ago. Furthermore, today's youth are alienated and question the rewards and values of traditional education. Television has also produced a non-reading age group. If competency standards are imposed in education, it seems clear that students from low income homes, alienated youths, and those with cultural differences are most likely to be caught in the competency game. Cawelti further states: The imposition of competency standards can also lead to poliferation of testing; the problem of establishing standards and competencies, curriculum imbalance, and the social effects of grade retention.[2]

The recent reports by prestigious national commissions have created new interest in competency testing programs. There is, however, a conspicuous lack of research devoted specifically to this area of study. This study is designed to provide information on one such minimum competency program.

---

[1]Report of National Commission on Excellence in Education, A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Education Reform, Superintendent of Documents, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C.

[2]Gordon Cawelti, "Requiring Competencies for Graduation," The Kappan 59 (May 1978): 88.

Statement of the Problem

In 1974, The Gary Public Schools adopted graduation requirements that included demonstrated proficiency in reading, writing, and mathematics (in 1976 speaking was added). The policy stated:

> Students not mentally handicapped or learning disabled are required to show by examination that they are able to read, speak, and understand ordinary English, able to perform with reasonable mastery, fundamental mathematical processes.[1]

The purpose of this study is to determine whether the Minimum Competency Program of the Gary, Indiana Community School Corporation is accomplishing its stated goal.

Significance of the Study

There are few if any studies on minimum competency programs which include minimum competency testing as a requirement for graduation. Since "A Nation at Risk Report"[2] was released there has been new-found interest in minimum competency testing. This investigator has undertaken this study based on this new interest in minimum competency programs and the lack of research on minimum competency programs.

---

[1]Gary, Indiana Community School Corporation Research Department.

[2]The Report of the National Commission on Excellence in Education: A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Education Reform, Superintendent of Documents, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., pp. 1-65.

The writer believes that this study will have specific implications and value for the Gary, Indiana Community School Corporation. Additionally, it may be beneficial to other similar school systems which may now be considering the use of minimum competency as a requirement for graduation.

Procedures

This section will outline the procedures used in this investigation. Included are the purpose of the study; the description of the procedure; and the collection and treatment of data.

Description of the Evaluation Model

In order to determine the model to be used in collecting the data for this study, numerous sources on research methods were examined.

According to Stufflebeam and Guber:

> The logical structure of evaluation design is the same for all types of evaluation, whether context, input, process or product evaluation. The parts briefly are: (1) focusing the evaluation, (2) collection of information, (3) organization of information, (4) analysis of information, (5) reporting of information and (6) administration of the evaluation.[1]

This investigation has undertaken this study using

---

[1] D. C. Stufflebeam, "Toward a Science of Education Evaluation," Educational Technology, July 30, 1968.

as a guide the CIPP Model of Stufflebeam and Guber (Context, Input, Process and Product Evaluation Model). This study utilized the product evaluation portion of the model. One major question directs this investigation. The question and an outline of the procedure used to conduct the inquiry follows:

Is the Minimum Competency Program of the Gary, Indiana Community School Corporation meeting its stated goal?

A. What is the goal of the Gary MCT program?

B. What was done to achieve the goal?

   1. What programs were implemented?
   2. How were these programs implemented?
   3. What circumstances developed through implementation?

C. What were the results of the program?

   1. Percent passing MCT from 1977-1984
   2. Diplomas denied from 1977-1984
   3. Staff opinion survey

D. Further Interpretation of Program results

   1. Relationship between racial/ethnic origin and test results
   2. Relationship between indigency and test results
   3. Interrelationship among Ethnicity, Indigency and Diploma Denial

The Center for the Study of Evaluation is an educational research and development center sponsored by the National Institute of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare. The work of CSE is devoted exclusively to the study of evaluation. The Center publishes a program Evaluation Kit which was developed as a guide for conducting inquiry. The data obtained for this study were analyzed by the guidelines set down in the Program Evaluation Kit of the Center for the Study of Evaluation.[1] This model is a detailed model incorporating the elements of Stufflebeam and Guba's CIPP Model. The following items were essential in conducting this investigation: (1) All administrative policy statements, philosophy implementation procedures, and progress reports were obtained from the Research Department of the Gary Community School Corporation. (2) Test score summaries of all proficiency exams administered during the period -- December 1974 and April 1984 were obtained from the Gary Community Schools' Research Department. (3) Interviews were held with appropriate school officials as needed, (4) Special areas of interest which were considered in conducting the study are:

--The goals and objectives for the program

---

[1] Lynn Lyons Morris and Carol Fitz-Gibbon, How to Present An Evaluation Report, Program Evaluation Kit of the Center for the Study of Evaluation, University of California at Los Angeles.

--The antecedents for the program

--The effect that the ethnic composition had on success in the program

--The effect that the socio-economic status plays in participant's success in the program

--Staff opinion -- questionnaire administered on the success of the program

--Staff opinion -- survey on goal achievement

Definition of Terms

Basic Skills Proficiency - An established minimum level at which students are required to pass a competency examination in a given area.

Indigency (socio-economic status) - Students who receive book rental fee waivers and/or receive free meals or reduced price meals.

Minimum Competency Testing Program - Basic Competency Program and Basic Skills Program are both used interchangeably with Minimum Competency Testing Program.

MPE - Math Proficiency Examination.

OPE - Oral Proficiency Examination.

Racial/Ethnicity - Two racial/ethnic types are presented in this study; non-white and white not of Hispanic origin.

RPE - Reading Proficiency Examination.

Socio-economic Status - See indigency.

Staff Questionnaire - Teachers who teach basic skills subjects were asked to respond to questions regarding the Basic Skills Program.

WPE - Written Proficiency Examination.

Chapter one has presented the introduction, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, procedures to be used in the collection of data for this study and a definition of terms used throughout this investigation. Chapter two will present a review of literature related to MCT programs.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

An extensive search of the literature revealed a lack of research specifically related to minimum competency testing as a requirement for a high school diploma. The writer conducted two ERIC searches using alternate descriptors and identifiers and found very little research devoted to existing minimum competency programs. The school systems which describe program characteristics and/or implementation procedures in any detail include Atlanta, Austin, Dallas, Denver, and Peoria.

The Minimum Competency Movement could well be the major reform of the twentieth century.[1] It has been called other things such as the great educational fad of the seventies. Whatever it turns out to be, the movement has already brought education into the headlines more than any topic since the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965. While ESEA focused attention on disadvantaged students, the Competency Movement is an attempt to give all

---

[1] G. M. Ratner, "Remedying Failure to Teach Basic Skills: Preliminary Thoughts," Inequality in Education: No. 17, Harvard University Center for Law and Education, June 1974.

students a chance to succed in school and in life.[1] For the purpose of this study the review of the literature will provide a historical backdrop to MCT and then focus on the following issues which are at the core of the Minimum Competency Testing (MCT) Movement: (1) decline in academic achievement, (2) accountability, (3) high school graduation requirements, (4) socio-economic status, (5) litigation involving MCT implementation, and pros and cons of MCT are presented to complete the review of literature.

Minimum Competency Considered Historically

Although a new surge of interest in competency began in 1976, the concept of minimum competency is nothing new. Its roots are evident in ancient history. About two thousand years ago, attempts were made to cultivate competency in oratory. In 1978, Neil reported that in primitive societies the training of youth was clearly directed toward making them competent in survival skills. European schools have traditionally been dominated by examinations for promotion at nearly every level and many private academies in this country have conducted entrance examinations (as do most colleges require ACT or SAT) as a requirement for

---

[1] S. B. Neil, (Ed.) The Competency Movement: Problems and Solutions, Arlington, Virginia: American Association of School Administrators, Critical Issues Report, 1978, pp. 5-8; 25.

admission. In various fields such as medicine, dentistry, nursing, law, and education, tests have been made for entrance, passage from one level to another, and certification or proficiency prior to graduation.[1]

The appraisal of achievement in the United States before 1850 had relied very largely upon oral examination. The teacher or visiting examiner asked a question. The designated pupil attempted to answer it. The questioner arrived at an immediate evaluation of the answer. There was uniformity neither in the question asked different pupils nor in the evaluation of their replies.[2]

During the latter half of the nineteenth century, oral examinations by boards of visitors were replaced by set written examinations as a basis for promotion or admission to an academy or college. Outside examination in turn yielded to evaluation by the classroom teacher. Whether carried out by an outside examiner or by a teacher, hoever, the technique was that of the essay examination, in which a pupil responded in his own words to a question set by the examiner.[3]

---

[1]S. B. Neil, The Competency Movement: Problems and Solutions, Arlington, Virginia: American Association of School Administrators, Critical Issues Report, 1978, pp. 5-8; 25.

[2]Robert L. Thorndike and Elizabeth Hagen, Measurement and Evaluation in Psychology and Education, John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York, 1955, pp. 1-2.

[3]Ibid.

The written examination had two advantages over the oral examination: (1) it presented the same tasks to each member of the group; and (2) it let each pupil work for the full examination period. However, though the task was made uniform, at least for the members of a given class, appraisal of each individual's response to the task remained highly subjective, depending upon the standards and prejudices of the particular scorer. Only since 1900 has there been any general development of objectively scored tests in which a pre-established key can be routinely and uniformly applied to the responses made by each pupil. Only since 1900 has the idea emerged of a general standard of performance for an age or grade, with which the performance by any class or any individual may be compared.[1]

One of the earliest attempts at requiring competencies for graduation was reported in San Diego High School in 1942. The competency requirements were in addition to the Carnegie Units and were called "Essentials for Effective Living." They were (1) ability to apply first aid, (2) ability to take care of one's self in the water, (3) ability to engage in two of three sports that may carry over into adult life, (4) ability to write business letters, and (5) ability

---

[1] Robert L. Thorndike and Elizabeth Hagen, Measurement and Evaluation in Psychology and Education, John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York, 1955. pp. 1-2.

to budget one's income.

Some additional competencies were required of boys and girls separately. Competencies for girls only were (1) ability to buy the right kind of food and prepare it, (2) ability to choose the right kind of clothes and to take care of them, (3) ability to take care of a home, and (4) ability to take care of children. Competencies for boys only were (1) ability to make minor repairs on household plumbing, (2) ability to use and take care of simple tools, (3) ability to repair simple electrical equipment, and (4) ability to repair furniture. Students in the eleventh grade were tested on the above, giving them the senior year to make up any deficiencies. Paper and pencil tests and demonstrations of proficiency were used to measure these competencies.[1]

More recently the Denver Public Schools have been the pioneers in developing the concept of requiring certain competencies for high school graduation in addition to the normal credit requirements. In 1958, following a public opinion survey among some four hundred Denver business and industrial employers, it was concluded that the reliability and validity of the high school diploma was questionable. Denver then began a cooperative effort with the California

---

[1] M. C. Hartung, "Education for Living," The School Review, 50 (March 1942): 173-174.

Test Bureau which culminated in the development in 1959 of the Proficiency and Review (Par) tests. These tests measure proficiency in four areas: Language, reading, spelling and arithmetic.[1]

The first PAR tests were administered to Denver seniors in 1960. A score of 70 percent was considered passing. Fifteen percent of the graduating seniors failed one or more parts of the test during their fall semester; the test was again administered in the spring semester after remediation on a voluntary basis. At the end of the first year that the test was required for graduation, about three percent of the seniors failed to get a diploma and were given certificates of attendance instead.[2]

The administration of the Denver test gradually moved from the twelfth, to the eleventh, to the ninth grade. If a student was found deficient, (s)he was channeled into basic courses in high school. Over sixty thousand students have been tested since 1962, the failure rate having stabilized between three and four percent. The tests prompted a state law in 1975 stipulating any special proficiency tests for high school graduation must be accompanied by regular or special courses, and each student who fails must receive

---

[1] J. Leake, "Denver Graduates Come Up to Par," NEA Journal, 52 (November 1963): pp. 24-25.

[2] Ibid.

remedial or tutorial services. The legislation also requires that such tests be given twice during each school year with initial testing to take place in the ninth grade. Parents of children who fail are to be notified once each semester of all proficiency test scores.[1]

The form of the MCT may vary from state to state. Legislation in Virginia, Pennsylvania, Arizona, Louisiana, Oregon, Colorado, and Nebraska requires state boards of education to develop a uniform exam for testing specified minimal education objectives. In Florida and Maryland, legislation not only stipulates that high school diplomas will be based upon passing a proficiency exam, but also that competency proficiency testing will be used to determine grade-to-grade promotions. Florida and California have legislated "early out exams," which in Callifornia means that a 16 or 17 year-old can leave school with an equivalent diploma if he or she passes the proficiency test. Despite any variation in form MCT[2] has gained steam and it appears as though it is here to stay.

---

[1] J. Leake, "Denver Graduates Come Up to Par," NEA Journal, 52 (November 1963): pp. 24-25.

[2] Jan S. Branch and Charles V. Branch, "Behind Minimum Competency Testing: Logic or Mislogic?" NASSP Bulletin 62 (October 1978).

Decline in Academic Achievement

When Russia launched Sputnik I in the late fifties it forced America to take a new look at its schools. What followed was the acceleration of the measurement movement and all the attendent problems associated with assessment. It is important therefore that the issues which underly the cause(s) of proliferation of testing be exposed. The Decline of Academic Achievement is one such issue.

Much of the public's reaction to the decline in academic achievement of high school students has been based in part on the fact that scores on the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) began a steady decline from 1964 until 1983-84. The SAT is designed to help determine student's apparent preparedness for college. Most students taking the SAT are seniors; some are juniors.[1] The one million seniors taking it annually represent 25 percent of their age group and about one-half of those going to college. Scores on both parts of the test -- verbal and mathematical portion of the SAT tests reasoning rather than formal knowledge, and requires a knowledge of the math taught in grades 1 through 9. The verbal portion covers antonyms, analogies, sentence competion and reading comprehension. A thirty minute test

---

[1] J. E. Roueche, "What Is College Level? Or Why Can't College Students Read and Write?" The Clearing House 50 (April 1977): 332.

of standard English was added in 1973 as a result of a suspected decline in writing skills.[1]

In August 1977 a special twenty-one member panel headed by former Secretary of Labor, Willard Wirtz, issued On Further Examination: Report of the Advisory Panel On The Scholastic Aptitude Test Score Decline. The report, sponsored by the College Entrance Examination Board and Educational Testing Service, culminated a two year investigation and received wide exposure in the popular press for several weeks. The report focused on the fourteen year decline of SAT scores, and the following information about high school graduates and standards revealed that:

> More and more high school graduates show up in college classrooms, employers' personnel offices, or at other common checkpoints with barely a speaking acquaintance with the English language and no writing facility at all.
>
> There have unquestionably been changes over the past 10 to 15 years in the standards to which students at all levels of education are held. Absenteeism formerly considered intolerable is now condoned. An "A" or "B" means a good deal less than it used to. Promotion from one grade to another has become almost automatic. Homework has apparently been cut in half. Open admissions colleges are available; if entering students don't know how to read, write, and do arithmetic, "remediation" is available.[2]

---

[1] S. B. Neil (Ed.), The Competency Movement: Problems and Solutions, Arlington, Virginia: American Association of School Administrators Critical Report, 1977.

[2] On Further Examination: Report of the Advisory Panel in The Scholastic Aptitude Test Score Decline, (Willard Wirtz, Chairman), New Jersey: College Entrance Examination Board, 1977.

A summary of the panel's findings indicated that two-thirds to three-fourths of the SAT decline between 1963 and 1970 was related to compositional changes of the group taking the test. These changes included the increasing high school graduation rate, extension of educational opportunities for minorities and the poor, reduction in the dropout rate, and the easing of college entrance requirements. Since 1970, about one-fourth of the decline has been attributed to compositional change. The report also offered the following causal factors for the decline:

> There has been significant dispersal of learning activities and emphasis in the schools, reflected particularly in the adding of many elective courses and a reduction of the number of courses all students are required to take.
>
> There is clearly observable evidence of diminished seriousness of purpose and attention to mastery of skills and knowledge in the learning process as it proceeds in the schools, the home, and the society generally.
>
> Particularly because of the impact of television, but as a consequence of other developments as well, a good deal more of most children's learning now develops through viewing and listening than through traditional modes.
>
> There have unquestionably been changes, during the period of the score decline, in the role of the family in the educational process.
>
> The concentration of the score declines in the three year period between 1972 and 1975 leads the panel to suspect strongly that one important element here was the disruption in the life of the country during the time when those groups of test takers were getting ready for their college entrance examinations.
>
> For whatever combination of reasons, there has been an apparent marked diminuation in young people's learning motivation, at least as it appears to be related,

directly and indirectly, to their performance on college entrance examinations.[1]

The hypothesis that relates score declines on college examinations to a more general decline in abilities of all high school students cannot be verified due to sampling errors and non-random selection of students. However this explanation -- accompanied by criticism of educational programs and priorities -- has received much media attention.

The National Institute of Education indicated that between 1965 and 1975 there were declines nationally on the following tests:[2] (1) American College Test (Composite), (2) Composite Test of Basic Skills, (3) Iowa Tests of Basic Skills (later grades), (4) Iowa Tests of Educational Development, (5) Minnesota Scholastic Aptitude Test, (6) National Assessment of Educational Progress: Science and Functional Literacy and (7) Scholastic Aptitude Test. All of the aforementioned variables served to reinforce demands that schools go "Back to the Basics."[3]

Some have felt that an examination of available evidence shows a much more ambiguous picture. Cawelti and

---

[1]On Further Examination: Report of The Advisory Panel in The Scholastic Aptitude Test Score Decline, (Willard Wirtz, Chairman), New Jersey: College Entrance Examination Board, 1977.

[2]National Institute on Education, Decllining Test Scores, Washington, D. C., February 1976.

[3]B. Brodinsky, "Back to Basics: The Movement and Its Meaning," Phi Delta Kappan, 58 (March 1977): 223-592.

Enchternacht have indicated that the media's concentration on SAT results has been most unfortunate since the National Institute of Education Report has revealed there were indeed increases or no change on scores for the following national tests:[1] (1) Air Force Qualifications Test, (2) American College Test (Science), (3) Iowa Tests of Basic Skills (Early grades), (4) National Assessment of Educational Progress: Reading Achievement, (5) Preliminary Scholastic Aptitude Test and (6) Project Talent.

Farr has suggested using a limited number of student SAT and ACT scores as a barometer of general achievement or reading ability. He made three observations:

> College entrance examinations cannot be generalized to all children. The population that takes these tests is made up of students who intend to go to college and who are able to pay the fee to take the tests.
>
> The advent of open enrollment in more institutions of higher learning and the decreasing high school dropout rate over the past twenty years means that more young people with a broader range of abilities consider college and take the entrance examinations.
>
> College entrance examinations are designed to assess how well students will do with the academic tasks of college, and they are not designed to measure reading ability.[2]

---

[1] Donald Henderson, Predicting Success On A Minimum Competency Examination, p. 31.

[2] See Donald Henderson, Predicting Success On A Minimum Competency Examination, p. 31.

In attempting to answer the question of what are the reasons or problems confronting the American public in their growing dissatisfaction with the system, Thiel summarizes the following concerns from the literature dealing with power structure and social system:

> The current social milieu (student apathy, lack of parental involvement, etc.).
>
> Criticism and reform following shocking events (Civil Rights Movement, Vietnamese War, etc.).
>
> Need for school, second only to family, to safeguard the traditional values of society.
>
> Need for schools to prepare leaders to solve the many pressing social, political and economic problems. (The magnitude of today's disrespect toward education makes accountability the battle cry.)
>
> The general state of the economy.
>
> Widespread agreement that something is wrong with public education.
>
> Better educated parents growing more critical in their expectations from schools and less willing to believe educational "authorities." They demand that administrators and teachers be more accountable for the progress of students.
>
> Recognition that a considerable faction of youth fail to meet the standards of literacy demands for civilian and military jobs.[1]

The emphasis on competency testing is a response to the widespread public dissatisfaction with the measurable outcomes of public schooling. A number of studies indicate

---

[1]W. Thiel, "Trends in Accountability and Educational Assessment Through Legislative Action." Doctoral Dissertation, Loyola University, Chicago, November 1975.

that whatever definition of literacy is used, substantial numbers are illiterate. One of the most recent of these studies published by the U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is the National Health Survey (1973). This study done from 1966 - 1970 concluded that an estimated one million American youth 12 to 17 years of age probably could not read as well as the average fourth grader, and thus could be called illiterate. The study showed that disproportionate numbers of Black youth were illiterate (15 percent), and that substantial numbers of White youth were also illiterate (3.2 percent). Not surprisingly, the study also found that the rate of illiteracy correlated with family income, declining from 14 percent in the lowest income group (less than $3,000.00) to 0.3 percent in the highest ($15,000.00).[1]

Another widely publicized study on illiteracy was the Adult Performance (APL) Project. The official introduction of the APL study occurred in October 1975 when Terrel Bell, the U. S. Commissioner of Education, announced the results of the four-year study. The APL study began in 1971 and was conducted by the University of Texas with a one million dollar grant from the U. S. Office of Education's Adult Education Division. Norvell Northcutt

---

[1]Donald Henderson, Predicting Success On A Minimum Competency Examination, p. 33.

directed the APL study team. The main objective of the APL project was to specify the competencies of the adult population of the U. S. Because the term literacy connotes a very low level of functioning, this study team coined the term "functional competency."[1]

> This research developed and validated a series of objectives which comprise adult functional competency; conducted a series of national assessments of performance of adults with respect to these objectives; and created as a by-product of the research, a protype test of adult functional competency.[2]

The APL study team identified five general knowledge areas necessary for functioning competence: occupational knowledge, consumer economics, government and law, health, and community resources. They found that on overall performance in these five areas, 19.7 percent of the population could be classified as "functionally incompetent." Another 33.9 percent could be classified as marginally competent; and only 46.3 percent were found to function with some degree of real competence. Northcutt also found that in order for an adult to gain competence in the aforementioned five areas, (s)he must be able to use the general skills of reading, writing, speaking and listening, computation and problem solving. Then matching these skills with the five general knowledge areas, the APL study team arrived at a

---

[1] N. Northcutt, Adult Functional Competency: A Summary, The University of Texas, Division of Extension, March 1975.

[2] Ibid.

redefinition of adult literacy in the form of sixty-five broad objectives that specify minimum competencies an adult must possess in order to function successfully.

The Texas study also noted great differences between whites and minority groups. They indicated that while 16 percent of Whites are estimated to be functionally incompetent, about 44 percent of Black and 56 percent of the Spanish surname groups are estimated to be so. The study team felt that these differences were probably due to the relatively lower levels of income, education, job status, and job opportunity found among groups in this country.[1]

These and other studies have served to identify serious shortcomings of many public schools in teaching basic educational skills. Also, numerous national studies have indicated that in the future, persons without mastery of basic skills will be increasingly doomed to functional unemployability. On the other hand some experts have pointed out that estimates of literacy vary widely as the measures employed. The variance in illiteracy rates results mainly from a lack of agreement as to what functional literacy is, and therefore, what should be measured.[2]

---

[1] N. Northcutt, Adult Functional Competency: A Summary, March 1975.

[2] Ibid.

Accountability

One of the outgrowths of the industrial revolution was the standardization of procedures as well as products. This way of thinking was not confined to the factory alone. It pervaded the entire value system of our country. It is necessary therefore to become acquainted with the accountability movement in this country and how this concept become important to this study.

Accountability is not a new trend in education. Scholastic achievements and records of formal study have traditionally been accepted measures of the outcomes of education. In 1911 Patten demanded that schools provide evidence of their contribution to society, or have their budgets cut. He urged schools to provide measurable results that could be readily seen noting that present schools were antiquated and turning out a useless product.[1] Leon Lessinger, sometimes called the "Father of Accountability," had a great impact on education during the seventies. He wrote Every Kid A Winner: Accountability in Education which became quite popular among those interested in the efficiency of education. When speaking of schools and their responsibility, Lessinger said, "Schools must define their output no

[1]D. Schofield, "Issues in Basic Education," School Leadership Digest, 2nd Series (Reston, Virginia: National Association of Elementary School Principals, 1976).

longer as teaching done, but as learning proven."[1] Yet by 1977 there had been a concerted effort by the business community to require schools to measure their product (student achievement) in terms of input-output. For example, Raymond Callahan in Education and The Cult of Efficiency, examined the origin and development of business values and practices in educational administration. He unexpectedly found, by examining many historical references in both the popular and professional press, that the extent of business ideology on American culture was phenomenal. Coupled with that was an extreme weakness and vulnerability of school administrators in establishing business practices acceptable to the general public. Callahan had hoped for more professional autonomy when he began his study, but instead found public criticism and local control the major forces in the capitulation of school administrators to business pressures. In tracing the beginnings of the business approach to education, he wrote:

> The procedure for bringing about a more businesslike organization and operation of the schools was fairly well standardized from 1900-1925. It consisted of making unfavorable comparisons between the schools and business enterprise, of applying business-industrial criteria (e.g., economy and efficiency) to education, and of suggesting that business and industrial practices be adopted by educators.[1]

---

[1] R. E. Callahan, Education and The Cult of Efficiency, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1962, p. 177.

Another observation by Callahan compared educational practices to those of the business world:

> Although education is not a business and the schools are not factories, no reasonable man can deny the advisability of applying certain business practices where they are appropriate to the work of the schools. But they are a means to an end -- the end being to provide the best possible education for our children. When efficiency and economy are sought as ends in themselves, as they were in education in the age of efficiency the education of the children is bound to suffer.[1]

Richmond described a renewal of the efficiency model being applied to education:

> Now another production metaphor intrudes its ugly little head: students as Model T, student as beer can -- all, of course, amendable to quality control. Let's have every kid graduate from high school with the same literacy skills, and let's do it in the same way Henry Ford turned out those black Model T's. Teachers will become the inspectors who stamp approval or rejection on the final product. Assembly-line metaphors are appropriate as long as the material that goes into making the final product can be controlled. Public schools do not have such control; they take everybody and anybody which is at once their strength and weakness.[2]

Humanistic psychologist regard learning not as a product but as a process resulting in a personal discovery and the integration of those personal discoveries into special meanings for the learner. They have, for the most part, adopted Maslow's self actualization as the primary goal education. This approach was also identified as

---

[1] R. E. Callahan, Education and The Cult of Efficiency, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1962, p. 177.

[2] D. B. Richmond, "Let's Get Rid of The High School Diploma," The National Observer, November 27, 1976, p. 24.

"holistic" to education.

Pine summed up the confusion over the push toward accountability in terms of developing mythology:

> Accountability has so many meanings and has been used in so many different ways for so many different reasons that the net result has been professional and public confusion; a rush to easy answers, plans of actions, and methods of evaluation; and a developing mythology of accountability.[1]

Proponents of accountability via minimum competency examinations for high school graduation have received much encouragement from Benjamin Bloom. He maintained that although children are different, their capacity to learn is nearly equal when provided with favorable learning conditions. Bloom claimed that 95 percent of the students in public schools could learn as well and as rapidly as the next child. Acknowledging that this is not what happens in the schools today, Bloom also charged that variations in the cognitive and affective learning histories of each child entering a sequence of study accounted for the lack of achievement of so many.[2]

While there were many proponents of the accountability movement, Arthur Combs, an outspoken critic, warned

---

[1]C. J. Pine, "Teacher Accountability: Myths and Realities," Educational Forum 40 (November 1976): p. 50.

[2]Benjamin Bloom, Human Characteristics and School Learning, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1976.

of the oversimplification of the use of behavioral objectives which provided a theoretical base for measuring outcomes. He maintained that such objectives produce a closed system of thinking and distort the thrust of education. Combs argued for a system of trust in a teacher's judgment, "Persons who never used judgment would be forever confined to what was immediately palatable and observable."[1]

Another example of the accountability movement manifested itself when lawmakers on the local and national level esculated attempts to pass MCT legislation.

Thiel in a review of the literature on accountability has concluded that because of total disagreement among the various power structures and the vocalness of public criticisms of education, the courts and state legislatures have "reacted" by the establishing of case law and statutory laws to change the educational system dealing with assessment of output.[2] According to Ornstein politics have played an important role in the move toward accountability. He also pointed out that most elected officials do not have sufficient time to read technical literature, and when they do, it usually is limited to the sections on conclusions

---

[1] Arthur Combs, Educational Accountability: Beyond Behavioral Objectives, Washington, D. C., Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1972, p. 19.

[2] W. Thiel, Trends in Accountability and Educational Assessment Through Legislative Action, 1975, p. 19.

and recommendations.[1]

Van Geel expressed the idea that court rulings on the right to an education have caused a rush to legislate quality education. This is evident since thirty-nine states have enacted legislation requiring some form of minimum competency testing.[2]

The accountability movement gained national exposure when Former President Nixon gave his views on the importance of school systems being held accountable for student achievement. He said:

> From these conditions we derive another new concept: Accountability. School administrators and teachers alike are responsible for their performances, and it is in their interest and that of their pupils that they be held accountable.[3]

The attention given to the accountability movement resulted in legislation being enacted in Colorado with a proficiency testing law in 1975. On December 7, 1977 it reached Indiana when Representative James Jones (R-Williamsburg) introduced in the Indiana House of Representatives a

---

[1] A. C. Ornstein, "The Politics of Accountability," The Clearing House 69 (September 1975): 5-10.

[2] See Van Geel, "Does the Constitution Establish A Right to an Education?" The School Review 82 (February 1974): 293; and J. Huber, "Hanger of Misapplication," NASSP Bulletin 58 (September 1974): 15.

[3] R. Nixon, Education Message, 1970, LT 311, L & T, T5, Loyola.

bill which would require every school corporation in Indiana to assume four responsibilities: (1) identification of minimum skills, (2) assessment of students' progress at specified grade levels, (3) establishment of remedial programs, and (4) assessment of juniors and seniors. Even though no action was taken in the 1977-78 legislature, the Indiana Education Commission put forth a resolution which called for the following: (1) local school districts must set performance standards, (2) testing must be required at specified grad levels, initially in reading, spelling and composition, (3) test results are to be used for remediation, and (4) local districts may use the test results for other purposes, e. g., as graduation requirements.[1]

The accountability legislation was initiated at the federal level by Congressman Ronald Mottl (D) representing the twenty-third district of Ohio. He introduced H. B. 9574 amending the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965 which provided for voluntary minimum competency examinations. This rule was a modification of his original bill, H. B. 6088 which required all state agencies to establish a program of mandatory basic educational proficiency standards before they could receive funds under the act. However, because the mandatory clause received so

---

[1] Donald Henderson, Predicting Success On A Minimum Competency Examination, 1980, p. 47.

much opposition from state and local education agencies -- including the Carter administration -- he reintroduced the bill to stipulate voluntary examinations.[1]

Admiral Hyman Rickover and Senator Claiborne Pell (D. R. I.) supported the development of a national test for graduation. However, it was noted that national standards and a national test would violate the one principle to which most educators cling; a locally controlled American education system.[2]

Accountability has been and continues to be an important issue in determining the question of educational competency. Until the questions of "who shall be held accountable and for what" are answered, the debate will continue. Attempts to legislate accountability (e. g. requiring completion of certain courses for graduation and/or passing tests) have proliferated. Therefore what courses and how many courses a student is required to complete to meet graduation requirements requires serious consideration.

---

[1] Donald Henderson, Predicting Success On A Minimum Competency Examination, 1980, p. 47.

[2] See W. G. Spacy and D. E. Mitchell, "Competency Based Education: Organizational Issues and Implications." Educational Researcher 6 (February): 9-15; and D. Schofield, "Issues in Basic Education." School Leadership Digest, 2nd Series (Reston, Virginia: National Association of Elementary School Principals, 1976).

Graduation Requirements

The accountability movement had a widespread impact on American education. This is evidenced by activities undertaken by the National Association of Secondary School Principals. One of the activities attempted to identify and analyze graduation requirements nationwide.

In 1974 the NASSP sponsored three activities that had a pervasive influence on minimum competency testing. First they set up a Task Force on Secondary Schools in a Changing Society to prepare "a definitive statement on secondary education" as perceived by practicing school administrators. Second, they formed a Task Force on Graduation Requirements throughout the country." Results were published in Graduation Requirements. Third, two NASSP staff members, James Clark and Scott Thompson prepared a monograph entitled Competency Test and Graduation Requirements. Thompson was also the chairman of both special task forces previously mentioned. These three activities, culminating in the publication and wide distribution of the reports, had a significant effect on the minimum competency movement."[1]

Clark and Thompson reported that many states responding to new times and new trends, are modifying their

[1] James Clark and Scott Thompson, "Competency Tests and Graduation Requirements, NASSP, August 1974.

graduation requirements. Among the forces acting to bring about this review and revision are these:

1. New legal prerogatives for youth. These prerogatives include a determination of the age of majority as 18 years, extension of the constitutional rights of minors, and reduction of the age required for the voting franchise.

2. New maturational circumstances. The menarche continues to move forward one-fifth of a year for each decade, or about one full year for every two and a half generations. Adolescence is likely to begin today at age 11 for girls rather than at age 13, and at age 12 for boys rather than at age 14.

3. New social conditions. Many youth today are granted social privileges at an early age. Family influence and control appear to be diminishing. Most youth in late adolescence (ages 16 through 19) appear to share common characterestics. They are mature in their mental processes but have yet to achieve an organized ego or a specific life plan. They seek real but tentative engagements in the adult world; they want to test themselves in society.

4. New job interests. About three-fourths of all youth at age 17 work either part-time or full-time. Most youth believe that school credit should be given for supervised service and work in the community.

5. New school-college relationships. Many institutions of higher education are revising their entrance requirements to make them more flexible. In addition, early admissions programs for qualified students are increasing. Opportunities for students to receive college instruction for college credit while in high school are beginning to unfold as well. Deferred admission plans are developing for students who desire to "stop out" between secondary school and higher education.

6. New attitudes about education. Interest in apprenticeships and other approaches to practical learning is developing. Education is becoming more broadly defined rather than being considered synonymous with "schooling." Alternative approaches to the diploma are being explored, and an interest in combining or alternating study at school with work and service in the community

is growing.[1]

Among those states who were reviewing and revising graduation requirements two trends were evident:

> An extension of local options to determine graduation requirements while concurrently reducing state requirements, e.g., revised graduation requirements in California, liberalize the options for local school districts. Rather than mandating a specific list of courses for graduation, California has moved toward requiring that instruction be available to students in most subject areas, including English, social sciences, foreign languages, science, mathematics, fine arts, applied arts, vocational-technical studies, physical education, and driver education. The actual requirements for graduation are largely a local mandate. In Florida students also may graduate under a plan of "student performance" developed by each local district.
>
> The use of performance standards as a requirement of the diploma:
>
> The second trend, application of performance criteria, is most apparent in Oregon and California. Oregon has established a requirement for "demonstrated performance" in twenty areas of personal, social, and career development as a qualification for the high school diploma. The criteria used to determine competency and the evaluation of the competency level attained are left to each district. Recommended state guidelines are available as a reference. In addition, twenty-one course units are required for graduation in Oregon.[2]

While the Task Force fell short of recommending competency testing, they made the following statements:

> Competency measures should be verified by: (1) Functional literacy in reading, writing and speaking; and

---

[1] National Association of Secondary School Principals This We Believe, Reston, Virginia: NASSP, 1975, p. 35.

[2] J. P. Clark and S. D. Thompson, Competency Test and Graduation Requirements, Reston, Virginia, NASSP, 1976, p. 2.

> (2) ability to compute including decimals and percentages. Credits should be verified by: (1) successful completion of semester units equal to normal student course load extending through the first semester of the senior year; and sufficient attendance in courses and programs to gain fully the educational and social benefits of group situations.[1]

At a 1976 conference sponsored jointly by HEW and NASSP, it was determined that secondary education has two basic minimums for which it must provide. Most of the one hundred conferees agreed that the Carnegie unit be retained "because it does measure time spent in the educational process." Many felt that it should be augmented with another dimension related to competency. The discussion answered the following questions: (1) How can competency be evaluated? (2) Should minimum competency be related only to paper and pencil exercises? (3) What is the role of the State indetermining competency? (4) Should competency graduation requirements be based on survival skills or mastery skills? (5) Competency requirements may lead to a single standard not really reflecting the diverse student bodies that most schools serve. (6) How should schools handle all of the record keeping that could be a part of the competency form of high school diplomas?[2]

---

[1] National Association of Secondary School Principals, This We Believe, Reston, Virginia: NASSP, 1975, p. 39.

[2] N. Patton, "Seven Cardinal Principles of Education Revisited," New Dimensions for Educating Youth: A Report on America's Secondary Schools, Reston Virginia: U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and NASSP, 1976, p. 17.

A great diversity exists among the fifty states in their high school graduation requirements. Some states legislate specific courses. In other states, local school districts determine the qualifications for graduation, including all course requirements. Some requirements are mandated by the state legislature and some by the local school board.

Local circumstances have tended to dictate graduation requirements. Consequently, not only does the nature of mandated courses vary, but the number of credits necessary to qualify for a diploma varies, as well, across the country.

Public interest in high school graduation requirements in recent years has been growing. This interest is one expression of society's broad review of education. It is also a result of family mobility and the growing awareness that a diploma has no common meaning among the states. Consequently, serious questions are being asked about graduation requirements: What do they signify? Should they be consistent? Are new criteria appropriate? These questions remain unanswered?

---

[1] James Clark and Scott Thompson, "Graduation Requirements" NASSP, August 1976.

Socio-economic Status

For the purpose of this study a review of literature on the "disadvantaged" becomes a must, because at the time of this study all of the high schools in Gary, Indiana had an indigency rate which exceeded 25 percent. This review will present information which demonstrates the effect socio-economic factors on educational processes. The mounting attention given to students from this strata was evidenced by the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, and thrust of the Civil Rights Movement, which in most instances, tended to be focused in this group.[1]

Historically studies have shown that there is a definite relationship between SES conditions and progress in school.[2]

In 1964 Havighurst noted the following characteristics of low SES children: (1) they are at the bottom of American society in terms of income, (2) they are widely

---

[1] Donald Henderson, Predicting Success On A Minimum Competency Examination, 1980, p. 64.

[2] E. L. Ballachey, et. al., Individuals in Society, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962. For an historical treatment of SES and schooling, see Leon J. Kamin, "Heredity, Intelligence, Politics and Psychology," a paper given at the American Psychological Association, 1973. First published in Clarence J. Karier, Shaping the American Educational State: 1900 to the Present (New York: The Free Press, 1975) pp. 367-393.

distributed in the United States, and (3) in racial and ethnic terms. There is some question about how they are distributed between whites and non-whites.[1]

In 1963 Deutsch presents a picture of a group of children low in motivation, unreceptive to and unskilled in the tasks and demands of the school, who find it difficult to communicate, possess negative self images, and who are frustrated from being in situations where they are unable to understand, succeed or be stimulated. Deutsch said of these low SES children:

> They come from impoverished and marginal social and economic conditions; their living conditions are characterized by great overcrowding in substandard housing, often there are likely to be large number of siblings, again with there being little opportunity for individualization. At the same time, the child tends to be restricted to his immediate environment. . . . In the child's home there is a scarcity of objects of all types, but especially of books, toys, puzzles, pencils, and scribbling paper. . . . The sparsity of objects and lack of diversity of home artifacts which are available and meaningful to the child, in addition to the unavailability of individualized training, give the child few opportunities to manipulate and organize the visual properties of his environment and thus perceptually to organize and discriminate the nuances of that environment.[2]

---

[1] R. J. Havighurst, "Characteristics of the Disadvantaged," Journal of Negro Education 33 (Summer 1964): 210-217.

[2] C. P. Deutsch, "Learning in the Disadvantaged," In H. J. Klausmeir and C. W. Harris (Eds.), Analysis of Concept Learning, New york: Academic Press, 1966, p. 167.

Conant added to this picture pointing that the achievement of these children is typically a year below their grade placement. Concerning the relationship between reading progress and socio-economic and cultural level, Conant stated:

> But in the college oriented suburb, the number of slow readers is relatively small and teaching children to read by no means looms so large and difficult a problem as it does in the slums. Some commentators have failed to recognize the relationship of the reading problem to the socio-economic and cultural level of the home. Concern with the reading of pupils, particularly the slow reader must continue well beyond the elementary school.[1]

The environment milieu of the low SES child offers few opportunities to develop the prerequisite skills necessary to attain mastery in reading. Auditory and visual stimuli in many lower class homes are generally restricted, unorganized and qualitatively different from the stimuli provided children of higher SES. The effects of these experimental limitations are reflected in the findings of a number of studies which indicate that disadvantaged children generally approach early school learning with significant perceptual, linguistic and cognitive deficits. Instead of overcoming these deficits, they get further behind as they progress through school.[2]

---

[1] J. B. Conant, Slums and Suburbs, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962, p. 23-24.

[2] Donald Henderson, Predicting Success On A Minimum Competency Examination, 1980, p. 66.

Epidemiological surveys have reported the prevalance of reading failure to be four to ten times more common among children of low SES groups in comparison to the rate of the rest of the school population.[1] Mary Deutsch has coined the term "cumulative deficit" to describe the tendency of the low socio-economic child to fail progressively behind in academic subjects with each successive grade level. By the time these children reach junior high school 60 percent are considered deficient in their reading skills by one to four years.[2]

Robbin in summarizing studies of socio-economic status related to school achievement revealed that measures of SES are often major predictors of the output variable. He further indicated that, in some cases, the prediction equations would require extraordinary changes in the school related variables to compensate for the impact that the socio-economic variables make on the prediction of the output variables. Socio-economic factors have been shown to affect student achievement much more so than school

---

[1]Mary Deutsch, Nursery Education: The Influence of Social Programming of Early Development, New York: Basic Books, 1967.

[2]In M. Deutsch, R. D. Bloom, C. P. Deutsch, L. S. Goldstein, P. A. Katz, A. Levinson, E. C. Petsach, and M. Whiteman, The Disadvantaged Child, New York: Basic Books, 1967.

controlled factors.[1]

Coleman, in his 1966 study, Equality of Education Opportunity (EEO), concluded that family background had the greatest effect on school achievement when compared to any one of the other variables which were included in his study.[2] Hill and Giammatteo investigated SES and its relationship to vocabulary, reading comprehension, or mathematic skills, problem solving and composite achievement scores. The population studied was 223 third graders from western Pennsylvania. Correlations obtained suggested that SES was an important factor in school achievement. The means obtained in basic skills indicated that by grade three children from the high SES group were eight months ahead of children from the low SES group in vocabulary development; and nine months ahead in reading comprehension. Average total achievement scores on the Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBC) showed a seven month's difference between the high and lower SES groups.[3]

---

[1] J. A. Robbin, Summary of Selected Major Studies Which Associate Inout and Output Variables with Various Measures of School Quality and Output. University of Arkansas at Little Rock, Division of Education, 1975.

[2] J. Coleman, et. al., Equality of Educational Opportunity, U. S. Government Printing Office, 1966.

[3] E. H. Hill and Grammatter, "Socio-Economic Status and Its Relationship to School Achievement in Elementary School," Elementary English 40 (1963): 265-270.

A study reported by Barton revealed that in classrooms where children came from working class families, reading grade levels were generally below actual grade levels in an increasingly greater percentage throughout the first six grades. Among children from the lower skilled, lower paid part of the working class, the differences were even greater. Barton concluded, "the most important single factor in progress in reading in school is socio-economic class."[1]

Litigation

The rush to legislate competency measures designed to improve student achievement often has resulted in legal action being taken by those individuals whom the litigation was supposed to help. More and more court cases are appearing which indicate that the controversy over MCT is far from being over.

Much educational litigation in this country has sought to equalize, upgrade, or in certain cases, restrict educational inputs. Cases have sought, for example, to equalize the educational environment and overall educational inputs for all students by racial desegregation

---

[1] A. H. Barton, Social Class and Instructional Procedures in the Process of Learning to Read, in New Developments in Programs and Procedures for College-Adult Reading (edited by Ralph Staiger and Culbreath Melton), Twelfth yearbook of National Reading Conference, 1963.

(Keyes v. Denver School District No. 1, 1973; Brown v. Board of Education, 1954); to increase the level of educational expenditures for certain students (San Antonio Independent School District v. Rodriquez, 1973; Serrano v. Priest, 1971); to require provision of school lunches (Davis v. Robinson, 1972; Briggs v. Derrigan, 1969); to abolish corporal punishment in the schools (Glaser v. Marietta, 1972; Wave v. Estes, 1971). However, little if any legal effort has been made to insure that schools successfully use their inputs to achieve perhaps the single most important output; that all children learn, at a minimum, the basic skills of reading, writing, and arithmetic.[1]

In 1954, The United States Supreme Court recognized that:

> Today, education is perhaps the most important function of the state and local government. . . . It is required in the performance of our most basic public responsibilities, even service in the armed forces. It is the foundation of good citizenship. Today it is the principal instrument in awakening the child to cultural values, in preparing him for later professional training, and in helping him to adjust normally to his environment.[2]

A recent rash of legal controversies has accused public schools of producing graduates who are illiterate

---

[1]K. Strike, "What Is A Competent High School Graduate?" Educational Leadership 35 (November 1977): 93.

[2]Brown v. Board of Education, 347, U. S. 483 (1954).

and unable to earn a living. Several high school graduates have sued the school system that were supposed to have educated them. The first known case to raise issues in this area was Doe v. San Francisco Unified School District. Peter Doe, as the plaintiff was designated in this case, had been graduated from a San Francisco high school despite the fact that he was unable to read at even a sixth grade level. The San Francisco schools were guilty of negligence and fraud. It was charged, that they failed to teach Peter Doe even those basic skills necessary for survival in our world despite the fact that he was capable of learning them. Thus, they were guilty of fraud because they gave Peter Doe a diploma attesting to the fact that he had achieved at a level suitable to be graduated from high school.[1]

While the case failed in court, it succeeded in the public forum. It struck terror into the hearts of principals, superintendents, and school boards throughout the country. It pointed out for all to see that a high school diploma was not a guarantee that its possessor had learned anything in high school. As a result, according to Strike educators and legislators became interested in defining and

---

[1]William D. Valente, Law In The Schools, Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1980.

testing for minimum competencies for high school graduation.[1]

A public school system's legal duty to ensure that all children learn the basic skills flows from a number of sources, including the due process and equal protection clauses of the U. S. Constitution, state statues and constitutions and state common law. From the outset, it should be understood that in our country, teaching children the basic skills of reading, writing, and arithmetic has been a central purpose of education.[2]

In Wisconsin v. Yoder the Supreme Court recognized that the teaching of the basic skills had a critical role in the entire mission of the public schools. Therefore, they reaffirmed that student learning of such basic education was essential to the economic and political existence of our country.[3] Indiana and virtually all other states have laws which compel all children under a certain age (frequently 16) to attend school. An overriding reason for requiring such attendance is so that children will adequately

---

[1]K. Strike, "What is A Competent High School Graduate?" Educational Leadership 35 (November 1977): 93.

[2]William D. Valente Law In The Schools, Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1980.

[3]Wisconsin v. Yoder: 92 S, Gt. 1526, 1576, 1531-32, 1536-39 (1972).

learn basic skills.[1]

On the other hand, Ratner argues that children are "deprived" of their "liberty" by being compelled to attend school. He states that for children who do not in fact adequately learn basic skills, the compulsory attendance laws tend to become irrational and deprive them of liberty without due process of law. Hence, they are in violation of the Fourteenth Amendment. As the court said in an analogous case involving the involuntary commitment of persons to a mental hospital for treatment:

> To deprive any citizen of his or her liberty upon the altruistic theory that the confinement is for human therapeutic reasons and then fail to provide adequate treatment violates the very fundamentals of due process.[2]

Although the courts have not yet determined what level of learning of basic skills is necessary for education to be "adequate," the Supreme Court has enunciated the standards by which such adequacy must be judged: A level sufficient to enable citizens to participate intelligently in the political process; to qualify for jobs and be economically self-sufficient; and to satisfactorily adjust to

---

[1] G. M. Ratner, "Remedying Failure to Teach Basic Skills: Preliminary Thoughts," Inequality in Education: No. 17, Harvard University Center for Law and Education, June 1974.

[2] Wyatt v. Stickney, 325 F, Supp. 781, 785, (M. D. Ala., N. D. 1971).

the technological, cultural, social, economic, and complexities of modern society (Wisconsin v. Yoder, 1972).[1]

Pros and Cons of Competency Testing

One must accept the fact that minimum competency testing is a reality in many school systems and states. Professional educators have expressed a wide range of views about pros and cons of the issue. Brickell, an advocate or fence rider, suggests that adopting a policy on minimum competency testing requires answering the following major questions:

1. What competencies will you require?
2. How will you measure them?
3. When will you measure them?
4. How many minimums will you set?
5. How high will you set the minimum?
6. Will the minimums be for students or for schools?
7. What will you do with the incompetent?[2]

Gilman suggested the following potential benefits of a minimum competency testing program:

---

[1] Wisconsin v. Yoder, 1972.

[2] H. Brickell, "Seven Key Notes on Minimum Competency." Phi Delta Kappan 59 (May 1978): 589-92.

The effect such programs will have upon what is taught in the schools. Whatever affects graduation requirements affects the curriculum.

The development of remedial courses.

Teachers may become more motivated to improve their techniques in teaching the basic skills.

The movement should provide a catalyst for examing what schools are doing.

Goals would become clearly defined.

Students would be more responsible for their learning.

It causes teachers, administrators, and students to be more accountable.

It can provide an opportunity to make clear to the community what the schools are all about.[1]

Cawelti identifies two benefits which can be derived from minimum competency testing programs:

Focuses the resources ofa school system on a clear set of goals.

Forces us to re-examine the nature of a general education for secondary students.[2]

Keefe and Georgiades suggest the following benefits:

Minimum competency testing provides an opportunity for communities to agree on common priorities and the basics of general education.

MCT Programs can give functional validity to the diploma.

Encourages early diagnosis.

---

[1]D. A. Gilman, minimum Competency Testing, 1978.

[2]G. Cawelti, "National Competency: A Bogus Solution," Phi Delta Kappan 59 (May 1978): 620.

> A firmer accountability base for administrators, teachers, boards of education and students would develop.[1]

Scott D. Thompson, writing in the American School Board Journal states:

> Competency tests should serve not only as an opportunity for students to identify deficiencies and to demonstrate important skills, but more importantly, provide an impetus for revising program sequences and content to help students reach desired levels of proficiency. The purpose of competency tests is to 'screen in' students, not 'screen out' students.[2]

Walker, a critic of minimum competency testing, indicates that professional educators can respond selectively to various features of a minimum competency program and in so doing make something positive out of the movement. He suggests that educators can support the movement's central aim -- to help all young people attain the fundamental skills they need to function effectively.[3]

In Competency Tests and Graduation Requirements, Clark and Thompson of the NASSP prepared an interesting list of possible positive and negative outcomes of minimum

---

[1]J. W. Keefe and C. J. Georgiades, "Competency Based Education and The High School Diploma," NASSP Bulletin 62 (April 1978): 94-108.

[2]Scott D. Thompson, "Before You Hand Out Those Diplomas: Should Your Students Prove They've Learned Something?" American School Board Journal, March 1977, p. 42.

[3]D. F. Walker, "The Hard Lot of The Professional in A Reform Movement," Educational Leadership 35 (November 1977).

competency testing. Positive possible outcomes were as follows: (1) The question, "What is a high school education?" must be squarely faced. (2) The statements required for each course will likely result in carefully organized teaching and carefully designed sequential learning. (3) Slow learners and underachievers will likely receive direct and immediate attention. (4) Courses of study will likely be revised to correct identified deficiencies. (5) Subjects leading to the development of competencies will receive additional emphasis. (6) Alternatives and options nor requiring attendance in class will likely be broadened. (7) The senior year may gain more holding power because of a new focus upon requirements and options. (8) The community will know the minimum performance required in specific areas for the diploma.

Possible negative outcomes included: (1) Confusion over the meaning of a high school diploma will continue if each district identifies its own level of competencies and performance. (2) The emphasis on pragmatic and practical competencies may result in erosion of liberal education. (3) The emphasis on measurable outcomes could result in less attention to outcomes which are difficult to measure. (4) The record-keeping system could become burdensome to teachers and administrators. (5) The conflict between "humaness" and "accountability" may be intensified as criteria

are established and clarified. (6) Community disagreement may arise over the nature and difficulty of competencies.[1]

Whether competency testing can help solve the problem of functionally illiterate graduates depends on how well such testing is done and how the results are used. Kazalunas has said:

> Decisions based on standardized tests are made every day in school administration, counseling, research, and in the classroom. For such decisions, it is important to have as much information as possible. Therefore it is not a question of whether tests should be used, but how.
>
> A standardized test can give precise answers quickly -- answers that are valid, reliable, and objective. This is true only if the proper test is correctly administered and the results are carefully interpreted. No other form of evaluation has all these advantages. But we must also keep in mind that tests are only one tool in decision making and are best used in conjunction with other evaluation methods.[2]

Chapter two has presented a review of the literature which has appeared in educational publications regarding the growth of minimum competency programs. Chapter three will present the data collected from the Research Department of the Gary Public Schools. The data are organized in much the same manner as the material found in the review of the literature.

---

[1] J. P. Clark and S. D. Thompson, Competency Tests and Graduation Requirements, Reston, Virginia: NASSP, 1976.

[2] John R. Kazalunas, "What's Right With Testing?" NASSP Bulletin 62 (October 1978): 62.

CHAPTER III

PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF DATA

The data presented in this chapter were collected from the Research Department of the Gary Community School Corporation, and an opinion survey of high school teachers of the Gary Community School Corporation. The data are organized in a manner to reflect the influence that reported issues appear to have had in prompting the Gary Superintendent to propose the original basic competency program. The data will include results obtained during the time the program has been operational. Policy statements, a staff questionnaire, racial/ethnic reports, and student indigency report results are given for the years 1974 and 1984.

The questions which direct this investigation are: A. What is the goal of the Gary MCT Program? B. What was done to enhance the achievement of the goal of the Gary MCT Program? C. What were the results of the programs? D. Were there further interpretations to explain program results?

Goal and Goal Achievement Efforts

In February of 1974, the Superintendent of Schools in Gary, Indiana, Dr. Gordon McAndrew, proposed to Division Heads and District Administrators that every student attending the Gary Public School System demonstrate basic skills proficiency before receiving a high school diploma. According to Superintendent McAndrew, students would be required to demonstrate proficiency by passing an examination indicating functional literacy. Functional literacy was assumed to be sixth grade achievement. The superintendent suggested a series of checkpoints at which students' achievement would be reviewed and remedial actions taken. The checkpoints thought appropriate were at the completion of kindergarten, primary, elementary, and the end of the eleventh grade.[1]

During the school year ending 1974, the Senior High Reading Task Force arranged a meeting calling upon representatives of over twenty-five agencies from business, industry, military, as well as, civic and social organizations to discuss the relevancy of instituting the basic skills competency program. The groups represented articulated the need for teacher and student accountability. Most agreed that a program such as a minimum competency program was a

---

[1]Gordon McAndrew. Memorandum to Division Heads and District Administrators Basic Skills Competence, Gary Community School Corporation Research Department. February 26, 1974.

step in the right direction. Many of those present expressed, on a very personal level, concerns about low achievement standards which had caused them to withdraw their children from the public schools.[1]

In a report to the Board of Education, dated September 11, 1974, Superintendent McAndrew formally proposed the basic competencies for graduating seniors. The recommendation approved by the Board on September 17, 1974 was as follows:

> Proposal on Basic Competencies for Grading Seniors
>
> I recommend that demonstrated proficiency in reading, writing, and arithmetic be required to receive a high school diploma from the Gary Schools. Students not mentally handicapped shall by examination show that they are (1) able to read, speak, and understand ordinary English; (2) write a simple, correct, intelligible paragraph; (3) perform with reasonable mastery fundamental mathematical processes.
>
> The exact procedures attendant to this requirement shall be worked out by a teacher-administration committee who will recommend to the Superintendent minimum standards of achievement, methods of assessment, and a plan for prevention and remediation of basic skill deficiencies from kindergarten through grade twelve. This requirement shall be effective with the graduating class of June 1977. It will be the responsibility of each high school principal during the current school year to notify seriously deficient sophomore students, as well as their parents, of the additional prerequisite for the diploma. Corrective programs, if not already operating, will be in effect no later than September 1975, and will be made known to students who need them.
>
> It is the purpose of this recommendation to guarantee that all students from the Gary Schools are competent

---

[1]Minutes from the Senior High School Reading Task Force, School Service Center, Gary, Indiana, July 1974.

> in the basic skills, to institute preventive and remedial programs by way of assuring this, and to have all parties -- staff, students and parents -- share in the responsibility for seeing that it happens.[1]

Program Implementation

A report to the Board of Education in September 1975 by Superintendent McAndrew indicated that significant progress had been made with the basic competency program. He reported that joint administrator/teacher committees had worked on problems. Tests had been developed to measure basic reading and math skills. Performance standards by grade level had been set. McAndrew asked the Board's endorsement on previous accomplishment goals and made the following recommendations for implementation:

I. Reading

A. Students designated as low achievers in the June 1977 class will be programmed for Reading I or Reading II -- the two levels of corrective courses planned to help them overcome their deficiencies -- in their junior year (September 1975). All students in the 1977 class will take a Reading Proficiency Examination (RPE) in January of 1976 and students who do not demonstrate proficiency in May of 1976. Those not passing will take the appropriate course, Reading I or Reading II, in their senior year. They will take the RPE again in January 1977.

B. June 1978 and June 1979 graduates will take the RPE in January of 1976. Those deficient will be programmed into Reading I in September of 1976.

---

[1]Gordon McAndrew, Program and Procedures For The Attainment of Basic Competencies, Gary Community School Corporation Research Department, (See Policy Manual for Basic Competencies, January 1976).

C. Subsequently, all Freshmen will take the RPE in January and will be programmedd into remedial courses as necessary.

D. The RPE will be given each January for those failing to pass the previous year's examination.

E. Provision will also be made for summer offerings which may lead to the fulfillment of this requirement.

II. Mathematics

A. The Math Proficiency Examination MPE will be given during the fall semester beginning in 1975.

B. Remedial math courses of a semester's duration will be given those in need during the fall and spring semesters of the Senior year.

C. Provisions will also be made for summer offerings which may lead to the fulfillment of this requirement.

III. Speaking and Writing

A. Plans and programs are in process for implementation of these requirements to take effect beginning with the graduating Seniors of 1978. Examinations designed to identify students who lack proficiency will be administered on a trial basis, and teachers will plan instruction to assist students in the basic skills.[1]

Circumstances Resulting from MCT Implementation

The position of "Basic Skills Coordinator" was created to direct testing related to the basic skills program. The position was staffed by a guidance counselor.

---

[1]Gordon McAndrew. Report to the Board of Education, September 1975. (Research Department Document, Gary Community School Corporation).

Each high school and each middle school was assigned a "Basic Skills Coordinator."

During the course of the program the amount of clerical work/recordkeeping increased to the point that a "Basic Skills Secretary" was added to the guidance staff in each high school.

Program Results

The Gary Community School Corporation administers minimum competency examinations (hereafter referred to as Basic Proficiency Examinations) in four different subject areas -- reading, mathematics, written expression and oral expression. These tests are given twice each year in each of these subjects. A student is scheduled to take the examination(s) for as many times as it takes for the student to pass that particular examination. There is no penalty assessed to the student for not passing the examination. However, as a result of the student not passing the examination, the student is assigned to a remedial class until a passing score is obtained on the examination.

The data which follow are taken from a summary report of the Research Department of the Gary Community School Corporation. Tables are presented which show (1) percent of students passing proficiency examinations June 1977 - June 1984 and (2) number and percent of pupils who did

not receive diplomas. Additionally, tables showing the percent of students passing the examinations during each school year (1977-1984) are used in a discussion later in this chapter.

The basic skills test results are reported in Tables 1 and 2 in a cumulative fashion with the data showing the current number and percent of students having achieved mastery scores by June 1984. In grade 10 the tests are given in the Fall, in the Spring, and in summer school to each pupil in need of demonstrating his accomplishment. The data in Table 1 indicate that there is a progressive increase in the percentage of pupils obtaining a passing score on the standardized tests. With repeated testing in grades 10, 11, and 12, gains slowly approach a percent in the upper nineties indicating broad grade level gains in minimal proficiency in the identified major instructional objectives. In the summary tables (found in the appendix) the data for grades 10, 11, and 12 show repeated testing with 99 percent at mastery as seniors in every area including writing.[1]

---

[1]Note Test Scores were reported for the Basic Competency Program beginning in 1977, Gary Community School Corporation Report, August 1984.

TABLE 1[1]

Percent of Students Passing High School Proficiency Exams June Results 1977 - 1984

	Subject and Grade Level											
	Tenth[2]				Eleventh[3]				Twelfth[3]			
YEAR	R[4]	M[4]	W[4]	O[4]	R[4]	M[4]	W[4]	O[4]	R[4]	M[4]	W[4]	O[4]
1977	84	--	--	--	89	84	--	--	--	--	--	--
1978	86	83	80	70	94	88	87	--	98	98	97	--
1979	91	87	80	72	97	95	92	86	98	98	97	--
1980	87	85	74	72	94	92	93	89	99	99	98	98
1981	89	88	73	76	94	95	90	91	99	99	97	98
1982	87	88	70	80	96	95	89	92	99	99	96	99
1983	89	89	76	79	96	96	90	95	99	99	96	99
1984	88	87	73	76	96	95	90	92	99	99	99	99

[1]Dr. William Hoock, Research Department Report, Gary Community Schools, July 1984.

[2]Number passing who took the test during the tenth grade.

[3]This percent is derived solely from students who take the test who have not previously passed the test.

[4]R=Reading; M=Mathematics; W=Writing; O=Oral.

The requirement of proficiency exams for graduation was introduced on a graduated basis with Reading and Mathematics in 1977, Writing in 1978, and Oral Language in 1980. The difference between 100 percent and percent passing in Table 1 represents the students who have FAILED or who have NOT TAKEN the test. In reviewing the data, the test results in Reading and Mathematics reveals a percent in the high eighties passing in grade 10, mid nineties in grade 11 and ninety-nine percent or higher by June of the senior year. In writing there is a general trend toward poor performance, which sometimes results in significant number of students who do not receive their diplomas in grade 12. The major obstacle is in writing a brief paragraph of five or more sentences, a test which is initially failed by about 30 percent of the students in the Fall of grade 10. The most recent data show that the passing rate in grade 10 has decreased about 3 percent in both Writing and Oral Language, 2 percent in Math and 1 percent in Reading. By 12th grade, however, there is a 99 percent mastery in each of four subject areas.[1]

---

[1]Gary Community School Corporation Research Department Report, Research Department, Gary Community School Corporation, July 1984.

Students Denied Diplomas

The summary of the number of students denied diplomas is reported in Table 2. With the increased areas of testing over the years of the number of pupils who had diplomas withheld rose from six in 1977 to twenty-one in 1978 to twenty-nine in 1979. In 1980 with the addition of Oral Proficiency the number dropped to fifteen students and there were no diplomas withheld for reading or math deficiencies. In 1981 the number of students who had diplomas withheld increased to thirty-six. Of this number twenty-two were in writing and nine were in speech. In 1982, twenty-three students had diplomas withheld. In 1983 the number rose to forty-nine with thirty failing the writing test. In 1984, twelve students did not graduate because of failure on proficiency tests with six of these being in writing.[1]

The first year that test score results from reading, mathematics, and writing examinations were made available for the basic skills program was at the end of the school year of 1978. Regardless of the subject matter area, test results showed that by the time a class reaches the end of the second semester of grade twelve, 99 percent of the students have achieved minimum competency (passed all tests).

---

[1]Gary Community School Corporation Research Department Report, Research Department, Gary Community School Corporation, July 1984.

The main reason for these results seems to be the remediation that is provided. Once a student has failed any one or more of the basic skills examinations (s)he is placed in the appropriate remedial class the following semester. (S)He remains in the class(es) until (s)he obtains a passing score.

TABLE 2[1]

NUMBER AND PERCENT OF PUPILS DENIED DIPLOMAS 1977 - 1984

Year	Enrollment[2]	No. of Pupils Denied Diplomas N/P-IV	Percent	Pupil and Subject Area[3]
1977	2316	6	0.26	2-R; 4-M
1978	2128	21	0.99	5-R; 6-M; 10-W
1979	2188	29	1.33	2-R; 3-M; 24-W
1980	2087	15	0.72	0-R; 0-M; 12-W; 3-0
1981	1946	36	1.85	7-R; 1-M; 22-W; 9-0
1982	1865	23	1.23	3-R; 4-M; 16-W; 4-0
1983	1823	49	2.69	3-R; 8-M; 30-W; 8-0
1984	1661	12	0.72	2-R; 3-M; 6-W; 4-0

[1]Dr. William Hoock, Gary Community School Corporation Research Department Report, 1984.

[2]June of the particular year.

[3]A particular student could have been denied a diploma for multiple subject area failure.

Staff Opinion Survey

In order to answer the question whether the Gary MCT Program was meeting its goal a representative sample of the Gary teaching staff was asked to participate in an opinion survey. On May 1, 1985, twenty questionnaires were sent to each of the five Gary, Indiana high schools. They were randomly distributed to teachers in each of the basic skills areas (English, mathematics, reading, and speech). Sixty-one questionnaires (61) were returned. There are four hundred seventeen secondary teachers (grades 9 - 12) in the Gary Public School System. This response represented 14.6 percent of high school teachers. One of the questionnaires was returned with no response(s).

The specific data requested on the questionnaire are shown in Table 3. Included in the data are the number of individuals responding toeach question and the percent of the total responses received.

A section of the questionnaire requested comments to be made regarding the program. Table 4 summarizes these comments and gives the number of individuals responding and the percent giving these responses.

From the beginning of the program the teaching staff voiced strong opposition regarding the implementation of the basic skills program. Because of this early opposition one could certainly question staff motivation. Some

TABLE 3
May, 1985
TEACHER OPINION SURVEY RESULTS

QUESTIONS	NUMBER RESPONDING Replied Made No Comments	Replied And Made Comments	TOTAL	% OF TOTAL
1. Do you think the Basic Skills Program is meeting its goal?				
YES	23	7	30	49.2
NO	1	20	21	34.4
UNSURE	5	3	8	13.1
NO RESPONSE	2	--	2	3.3
TOTAL	31	30	61	100.0
2. Do you think the program would achieve more significant gains were it to be modified or changed?				
YES	4	28	32	52.5
NO	13	2	15	24.6
UNSURE	13	0	13	21.3
NO RESPONSE	1	--	1	1.6
TOTAL	31	30	61	100.0

TABLE 4

	COMMENTS	NUMBER RESPONDING[1]	% OF TOTAL RESPONSES[2]
1.	Standards too low and should be raised	20	47.6
2.	Move MCT requirement for graduation to the middle school or lower grades	4	9.5
3.	Test administration should be more uniform	3	7.1
4.	Instruction should be geared to teach thinking	3	7.1
5.	Make curricular changes to include writing as a subject matter area	2	4.8
6.	Smaller remedial classes	2	4.8
7.	More remediation needed	2	4.8
8.	Duplication occurs between reading and writing exams	1	2.4
9.	Should return to basics	1	2.4
10.	Classes should be uniform throughout the system	1	2.4
11.	Special consideration in staff selection	1	2.4
12.	Special consideration in selection of materials	1	2.4
13.	Question teacher motivation	1	2.4
	TOTAL	42	100.0

[1]Number who made comments.

[2]Percent of the total who made comments.

evidence of staff dissatisfaction became apparent when results from the staff questionnaire were analyzed (See Tables 3 - 4).

One of the questions asked on the survey was: "Do you think the program would achieve more significant gains were it to be modified or changed?" Yes was indicated by 52.5 percent, no by 24.6 percent, Unsure by 21.3 percent, and one questionnaire was returned with no response(s) (1.6 percent). When the staff was asked to comment on how the program should be modified or changed, the standards were too low and should be raised was indicated by 47.6 percent. The following comments and percent of total responses of the staff follow:

Move MCT requirement for graduation to the middle or lower grades	9.5%
Test administration should be more uniform	7.1%
Instruction should be geared to teach thinking	7.1%
Make curricular changes to include writing as a subject matter area	4.8%
Smaller remedial classes	4.8%
More remediation needed	4.8%
Duplication occurs between reading and writing exams	2.4%
Should return to basics	2.4%
Classes should be uniform throughout the System	2.4%
Special consideration in staff selection	2.4%
Question teacher motivation	2.4%

A majority of the respondents indicated that the program was accomplishing its stated goal, but a majority (64.0 percent) were also dissatisfied with one or more aspects of the program.

Thirty of the sixty-one respondents who returned the questionnaires also made comments regarding the program. Several of these respondents went into some detail regarding changes, suggestions, and/or their evaluation of the existing program. These comments follow:

> After having taught basic composition and having graded the written proficiency test for a number of years, I firmly believe that the written basic skills program has been effective. As a grader I have seen an improvement in the overall quality of writing among our students. I think it would be disastrous to eliminate the program. I also believe that the program could be improved with some modifications: (1) teachers of basic skills classes throughout the school system need to have uniformity of objectives and goals; we need to meet in workshops or seminars to find out what is going on in various classrooms. (2) Schools should handle the programs and classes in a uniform manner. There is great disparity from one school to another, it seems. Even the names of the classes differ. (3) These variances could be eliminated by close coordination of supervision, perhaps. (I believe that this program is one of the best things to come from the McAndrew administration).[1]

> First it should be changed to the regular grading system instead of "P" or "F". The motivation that you "must pass the test" does not work. The only time the students work is a week before the test. Most students are embarrassed by being in this class -- so once they have passed the test they should be placed in a course with the same calibre of material but without the label "Basic." Keeping the classes small allows for more individualized instruction (10 - 18 students).[2]

---

[1] Teacher Opinion Survey (See appendix)

[2] Ibid.

> It appears to me that the Basic Skills Program has been "watered down." The high goals of the program no longer exist as they did originally because we, teachers, educators, feel that we must give students every possible consideration, and we in turn have lowered our standards. Basically, we should return to the high standards that existed at the original implementation of the program.[1]

Further Interpretations of MCT Results

Studies have shown (pages 38, 39, 40, 41, 42) that race/ethnicity and SES exert some influence on academic achievement. Students who come from backgrounds which are non-white and indigent traditionally do less well than their affluent white and non-white counterparts. The data which follow are used to determine what effect, if any, ethnicity and indigency had on student achievement (meeting MCT requirements).

Racial/Ethnic Orientation

Gary, Indiana, being the highly industrialized center that it is, attracted large nu;mbers of Blacks, Latinos, and American Indians (as well as their cultures) during the migration of the fifties and sixties. The data presented in this section show how some schools have evolved from a majority white population to a non-white majority. (Lew Wallace, William A. Wirt)

---

[1] Teacher Opinion Survey (See appendix)

In 1974 there were six high schools in the Gary, Indiana Public School System. Since 1981, because of population decline, there have been five high schools. All but two of the high schools (Lew Wallace and William A. Wirt) have had a greater than 97 percent non-white population during the period from 1974 through 1984.

While some school populations have a high non-white enrollment -- the Black-Latino population may differ from school to school. One of these schools (Theodore Roosevelt) has been all Black throughout this period (1974-1984).

TABLE 5
Pupils in Membership - September 1978 - June 1979

School	Percent Non-White	Percent White, Not Of Hispanic Origin
Mann	98.57	1.43
Roosevelt	100.00	0.00
Wallace	56.39	43.61
West Side	99.29	0.71
Wirt	44.82	55.18

TABLE 6
Pupils in Membership - September 1983 - June 1984

School	Percent Non-White	Percent White, Not of Hispanic Origin
Mann	99.51	0.49
Roosevelt	100.00	0.00
Wallace	90.80	9.20
West Side	99.28	0.72
Wirt	84.31	15.69

Socio-economic Status

Who are the disadvantaged? The disadvantaged cannot be defined by race, residence, jobs, or behavior alone. Although we tend to think first of such districts as Harlem in New York City or Robert Taylor Homes in Chicago, the disadvantaged are to be found in small towns, in the rural slums of backwoods Appalachia, in the Spanish barrios of El Paso, on American Indian reservations -- or on the fashionable streets of Scarsdale, New York or Winnetka, Illinois. They are black, white, red, and yellow; with or without parents; hungry or overfed; they are the children of the jobless, the migrant workers, or the employed.[1]

> The only thing they have in common is that all are left out of a process which purports to carry all humankind, regardless of background, towards the same basic goals: physical comfort and survival, and feelings of potency, self-worth, connection with others, and concern for the common good. Anyone deprived of the means to reach any of these human goals is disadvantaged, for it is the purpose of our democratic social institutions to advance the development of these human goals for all people. Failure in human goal attainment is therefore a reflection of institutional failure and, until our social institutions in general, and the schools in particular, are equipped to satisfy these goals, full human development is thwarted. Until then we are all disadvantaged. Our focus will, of necessity, be on the obvious institutional casualities, but the implications for all should be recognized.[2]

---

[1] Mario Fantini and Weinstein, The Disadvantaged, Harper and Roe Publishers, New York, 1968, p. 5.

[2] Ibid.

The tendency to view the disadvantaged as just that segment of the population at the negative extremity of the social continuum is illustrated in the very labels employed by professionals. Riessman explains also that the terms culturally deprived, educationally deprived, deprived, underprivileged, disadvantaged, lower class, and lower socioeconomic group are synonymous.[1] There are others: culturally different, working class, slum culture, innercity dwellers, culturally impoverished, experientially deprived, culturally handicapped, educationally disadvantaged, children of the poor, and many more.[2]

For the purpose of this study the term indigent is used to indicate those students who receive book rental fee waivers and/or receive free meals or reduced priced meals.

TABLE 7

School Year 1978 - 1979
Pupil Personnel Department Report on Ratio of Indigent Students to School Membership

School	Percent Indigency	School Enrollment
Mann	17.21	1592
Roosevelt	19.89	2363
Wallace	11.78	2054
West Side	15.42	2932
Wirt	11.76	1156

[1] F. Riessman, The Culturally Deprived Child, New York, Harper and Row, 1962, p. 6.

[2] Mario Fantini and Weinstein, The Disadvantaged, New York, Harper and Row, 1968.

TABLE 8

School Year 1983 - 1984
Pupil Personnel Department Report on Ratio of
Indigent Students to School Membership

School	Percent Indigency	School Enrollment
Mann	30.52	1173
Roosevelt	40.23	1981
Wallace	31.83	1750
West Side	32.89	1739
Wirt	26.68	1128

Interrelationship Among Ethnicity, Indigency and Diploma Denial

The tables which follow present data which include percent indigency by school, percent non-white by school, twelfth grade enrollment by school, and the number and percent of students denied diplomas by school.

No attempt was made to analyze the data statistically, but several observations can be made. These observations are derived primarily from tables nine through fourteen, but other data were also considered.

TABLE 9
ETHNICITY, INDIGENCY, AND DIPLOMAS DENIED BY SCHOOL
June 1979

School	% Non-white Total School	% Indigency Total School	12th Grade[1] Enrollment	Denied Diplomas[2] Number	Percent
Mann	99.37	17.21	291	--	--
Roosevelt	100.00	19.89	420	--	--
Wallace	66.07	11.78	455	--	--
West Side	98.85	15.42	612	--	--
Wirt	52.54	11.76	249	--	--

[1]State Report - Form DPI - EIR-6, submitted June of current year.

[2]Not reported until June, 1981.

TABLE 10
ETHNICITY, INDIGENCY, AND DIPLOMAS DENIED BY SCHOOL
June 1980

School	% Non-white Total School	% Indigency Total School	12th Grade[1] Enrollment	Denied Diplomas[2] Number	Percent
Mann	99.67	14.28	282	--	--
Roosevelt	100.00	19.25	369	--	--
Wallace	71.00	12.35	372	--	--
West Side	99.52	16.07	611	--	--
Wirt	56.38	11.74	241	--	--

[1]State Report - Form DPI-E EIR-6, Submitted June of current year.

[2]Not reported until June, 1981.

TABLE 11
ETHNICITY, INDIGENCY, AND DIPLOMAS DENIED BY SCHOOL
June 1981

School	% Non-white Total School	% Indigency Total School	12th Grade[1] Enrollment	Denied Diplomas[2] Number	Percent
Mann	98.93	15.76	302	5	01.66
Roosevelt	100.00	19.49	373	9	02.41
Wallace	78.67	14.89	392	6	01.53
West Side	99.25	14.03	488	3	00.61
Wirt	64.91	19.46	227	0	00.00

[1]State Report - Form DPI - EIR-6, submitted June of current year.

[2]Dr. William Hoock, Seniors Denied Diplomas Due to Proficiency Requirements. Test assessment Center. Gary Community School Corporation. Memorandum dated June 16, 1982.

TABLE 12
ETHNICITY, INDIGENCY, AND DIPLOMAS DENIED BY SCHOOL
June 1982

School	% Non-white Total School	% Indigency Total School	12th Grade[1] Enrollment	Denied Diplomas[2] Number	Percent
Mann	98.78	18.85	276	9	03.26
Roosevelt	100.00	19.00	413	4	00.96
Wallace	84.44	21.48	404	5	01.23
West Side	99.65	21.21	484	4	00.83
Wirt	77.11	14.11	257	3	01.18

[1]State Report - Form DPI - EIR-6, Submitted June of current year.

[2]Dr. William Hoock, Seniors Denied Diplomas Due to Proficiency Requirements. Test Assessment Center. Gary Community School Corporation. Memorandum dated June 17, 1982.

TABLE 13
ETHNICITY, INDIGENCY, AND DIPLOMAS DENIED BY SCHOOL
June 1983

School	% Non-white Total School	% Indigency Total School	12th Grade[1] Enrollment	Denied Diplomas[2] Number	Percent
Mann	99.84	27.53	246	8	03.25
Roosevelt	100.00	30.35	443	5	01.13
Wallace	87.91	22.78	393	8	02.04
West Side	99.76	26.04	434	21	04.84
Wirt	80.83	9.99	275	2	00.72

[1]State Report - Form DPI - EIR-6, Submitted June of current year.

[2]Dr. William Hoock, Seniors Denied Diplomas Due to Proficiency Requirements. Gary Community School Corporation. Memorandum dated June 21, 1983.

TABLE 14
ETHNICITY, INDIGENCY, AND DIPLOMAS DENIED BY SCHOOL
June 1984

School	% Non-white Total School	% Indigency Total School	12th Grade[1] Enrollment	Denied Diplomas[2] Number	Percent
Mann	99.51	31.79	199	6	03.02
Roosevelt	100.00	38.46	444	3	06.68
Wallace	90.80	26.12	335	0	00.00
West Side	99.28	29.58	379	3	07.91
Wirt	84.31	24.60	282	0	00.00

[1]State Report - Form DPI - EIR-6, Submitted June of current year.

[2]Dr. William Hoock, Seniors Denied Diplomas Due to Proficiency Requirements - June - 1984. Gary Community School Corporation. Memorandum dated June 15, 1984.

Discussion

Tables nine through fourteen show ethnicity, indigency, and diploma denial by school from June of 1979 through June of 1984. It should be noted here that the number of students denied diplomas was not reported until 1981.

For the purpose of clarity, as well as to determine possible trends, the discussion will focus on data by schools during two year intervals in lieu of a discussion of each table.

In 1979, Horace Mann High School had an enrollment of 291 seniors; in 1980, 282 seniors were enrolled. The school was 99.37 percent non-white in 1979 and 99.67 percent in 1980. The indigency rate was 17.21 percent in 1979 and 14.28 percent in 1980. These data show a slight increase in non-white enrollment and nine fewer students enrolled in the senior class. During this same two year period there was a 2.93 percent decrease in the number of indigent students.

In June of 1981, Horace Mann High School had a total non-white population of 98.93 percent and a 98.78 percent population in 1982. The indigency rate was 15.76 percent in 1981 and 18.85 percent in 1982, an increase in indigency of 3.09 percent as compared to a lower indigency rate the previous year. There were 302 seniors enrolled in the school in 1981 and 276 in 1982. Five seniors or 1.66 percent were denied diplomas in 1981 and nine or 3.26 percent in 1982.

During the school year 1983, the total non-white population was 99.84 percent, in 1984, 99.51 percent. The indigency rate was 27.53 percent in 1983 and 31.79 percent in 1983, a 13.26 percent increase. There were 246 seniors enrolled in 1983 of which eight or 3.25 percent were denied diplomas. In 1984, 199 seniors were enrolled of which six or 3.02 percent were denied diplomas for failing the minimum requirements.

In summary, from 1979-84, Horace Mann High School has remained 99 percent non-white. The indigency rate has risen 14.58 percent. There was an overall decline in enrollment for the six year period 1979-1984, showing a slight increase in non-white enrollment for 1981. The number of students denied diplomas for failing minimum requirements was highest for the year 1982. However, more than 95 percent of the students enrolled in Horace Mann High School met the minimum requirements for graduation.

Roosevelt High School was 100 percent non-white in 1979 and 100 percent non-white in 1980. There was an indigency rate of 19.89 percent in 1979 and 19.25 percent in 1980. There were 420 seniors enrolled in 1979 and 369 in 1980, 51 less thanthe previous year.

In 1981 and 1982 Roosevelt High School remained 100 percent non-white. The indigency rate was 19.49 percent for 1981 and 19.00 percent in 1982, a neglible decrease. There

were 373 seniors enrolled in 1981. Nine or 2.41 percent of these seniors were denied diplomas in 1981. In 1982, 413 seniors were enrolled, an increae in enrollment of forty. Four or .97 percent of these seniors were denied diplomas.

In 1983 and 1984, Roosevelt High School continued to be 100 percent non-white. There was a 30.35 percent indigency rate in 1983, an approximate 10 percent increase over the previous year. In 1984, the indigency rate increased more than 8 percent to 38.46 percent. There were 443 seniors enrolled in the class of 1983 of which five or 1.13 percent were denied diplomas. For the year 1984, 444 seniors were enrolled, three or .68 percent were denied diplomas.

Roosevelt High School has traditionally been non-white. The indigency rate rose over the six year period 1979-1984 by 18.57 percent.

Wallace High School was 66.07 percent non-white in 1979 and 71.00 percent non-white in 1980, an increase in non-white enrollment of five percent. In 1979, the indigency rate at Wallace was 11.78 percent and 12.35 percent in 1980, a slight increase. There were 455 seniors enrolled in 1979 and 372 in 1980. The senior enrollment decreased by 83 students.

In 1981, the non-white enrollment had increased to 78.67 percent and to 84.44 percent in 1982. The indigency rate was 14.89 percent in 1981 and increased to 21.48

percent in 1982. There were 392 seniors enrolled in 1981, of which six or 1.53 percent were denied diplomas. Four hundred four seniors were enrolled in 1982, a slight increase, of which five 1.24 percent were denied diplomas.

Wallace High School had a 87.91 percent non-white enrollment in 1983 and 90.80 percent in 1984. The indigency rate was 22.78 percent in 1983 and increased to 26.12 percent in 1984. There were 393 seniors enrolled of which eight or 2.04 percent were denied diplomas in June of 1983. In 1984, there were 335 seniors enrolled at Wallace, all meeting the minimum requirements for graduation.

Wallace High School's non-white population increased 21.84 percent over the six year period 1979 - 1984. Likewise the indigency rate increased by 14.34 percent. There was also a decrease in enrollment. For Wallace High School during the six year period, indigency rate and the non-white population rose. There was also a decrease in enrollment, although it fluctuated during the 1981, 82 and 83 school years.

West Side High School had a non-white enrollment of 98.85 percent in 1979 and 99.52 percent in 1980. The indigency rate at West Side was 15.42 percent and increased to 16.07 percent in 1980. There were 612 seniors enrolled in 1979 and 611 in 1980.

The non-white population at West Side was 99.25

percent in 1982. There was an indigency rate of 14.03 percent in 1981 and 21.21 percent in 1982, an increase of seven percent. There were 488 seniors enrolled in 1981 of which three or .61 percent were denied diplomas. In 1982, four or .83 percent of the 484 seniors enrolled in West Side were denied diplomas.

The non-white population at West Side was 99.76 percent in 1983 and 99.28 percent in 1984. The indigency rate was 26.04 percent in 1983 and 29.58 percent in 1984, an increase of 3.54 percent. There were 444 seniors enrolled, of which twenty-one or 4.73 percent were denied diplomas in 1983. In 1984, there were 379 seniors enrolled at West Side, three or .79 percent were denied diplomas.

West Side High School's non-white enrollment remained relatively constant during the six year period 1979-1984. The indigency rate increased by 14.08 percent during the same period.

Wirt High School had a non-white enrollment of 52.54 percent in 1979 and 56.38 percent in 1980. There was an indigency rate of 11.76 percent in 1979 and 11.74 in 1980. In the school year 1979, there were 249 seniors enrolled at Wirt School and 241 in 1980. The indigency rate and enrollment remained relatively constant.

In 1981, Wirt had a non-white population of 64.91 percent and an increase of more than twelve percent to 77.11 percent in 1982. There was an indigency rate of 19.46

percent in 1981 and 14.11 percent in 1982 a decrease in indigency of approximately five percent. There were 227 seniors enrolled at Wirt School in 1981, all of which met the minimum requirements for graduation. In 1982 three or 1.17 percent of the 257 seniors were denied diplomas.

Wirt's non-white population increased to 80.83 percent in 1983 and four percent in 1984 to 84.31 percent. The indigency rate was 9.99 percent and 24.60 percent in 1984, an increase of more than fourteen percent. In 1983, two or .73 percent of the 275 seniors were denied diplomas. In 1984, all 282 seniors met the minimum requirements for graduation.

Wirt High School's non-white population increased 41.77 percent from 1979 to 1984. The indigency rate at Wirt High School varied with a low of 9.99 percent in 1983 and a 24.60 percent in 1984, while the 1979 rate was 11.76 percent.

From an examination of these data, the following observations can be made for the period 1979 - 1984:

1. The non-white population increased in all schools. The exception being Roosevelt High School which has been virtually 100 percent non-white since 1984.

2. The population of most of the senior classes declined.

3. There was an increase in indigency at virtually all five schools. Given the fact that Gary is currently economically depressed, the indigency rate of students reflects the economic status of this community.

4. More than ninety-five percent of all seniors in the six classes pass the minimum competency requirements for graduation.

5. According to these data, indigency did not influence failure rate on minimum competency tests required for graduation.

Chapter three has presented data collected from the Research Department of the Gary Public Schools, results from a Staff Opinion Questionnaire and a discussion of the data provided by the Departments of Finance, Pupil Personnel and Research of the Gary Public Schools. Chapter four will present the summary, concludions, recommendations, and recommendation for further study.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The Gary, Indiana Minimum Testing Program was started in February 1974. The Superintendent of Schools, Dr. Gordon McAndrew submitted a proposal to division heads and district administrators that all Gary Public School students demonstrate basic skills proficiency before receiving a high school diploma. In September 1974 the Board of School Trustees approved the superintendent's proposal.

The original goal and the only goal of the basic skills program was to establish a minimum level at which a student was required to pass a competency examination in reading, mathematics, writing, and oral expression. This was to be an additional requirement for obtaining the high school diploma. The standards which were set for functional literacy were assumed to be sixth grade achievement.

Testing for the program began during the school year 1976-1977. The first full compliment of testing occurred in 1977-1978. The requirement for proficiency examinations as a requirement for graduation began on a graduated basis -- reading and mathematics in 1977, writing in 1978 and oral language in 1980.

The number of students who were denied diplomas beginning with 1977 was six, twenty-one were denied diplomas in 1978, twenty-nine in 1979, fifteen in 1980, thirty-six in 1981, twenty-three in 1982, forty-nine in 1983 and twelve in 1984. In each of the years cited, the majority of students who had diplomas withheld, had them withheld because they failed the written examination.

> Writing has been the most difficult skill to teach and remains the most difficult area over the last seven years.[1]

When the announcement was made introducing MCT as a requirement for graduation, the instructional staff had mixed opinions regarding the implementation of the MCT Program. There is evidence that opinions are mixed even now.

The student population in Gary Public Schools has changed from a white majority to a non-white majority over the past twenty years. Additionally, because of the decline of the steel industry and its inevitable effect on unemployment, many students are classified as indigents (low socio-economic status).

Research has shown that these two factors (ethnicity and low SES) tend to affect the level of achievement of students who come from these backgrounds.

The basic finding of this study is when remediation

---

[1] Gary Community School Corporation Research Department Report, 1984.

is begun early enough and performed under the proper circumstances, positive results may be expected. Even where ethnicity and indigency are prominent factors in a population remediation may be used to offset the impact these factors have on student achievement.

Conclusion

1. The original goal of the Gary MCT Program which required each student to pass a competency examination prior to graduation in reading, mathematics, writing, and speaking was met. The following evidence is presented to substantiate this conclusion:

(a) Each year since all four of the competency tests have been required for graduation, ninety-nine percent of the members of the graduating class have met the competency requirement.

(b) A majority of staff members who responded to a questionnaire in May 1985 felt that the MCT Program had met its goal.

(c) Administrators who made comments regarding the program felt that the program had met its goal.

(d) There is no available evidence to indicate that the goal was not met.

2. Remediation is the single most important causal factor in the Gary MCT Program meeting its goal.

When a student fails a competency test (s)he is placed in a remedial class in that competency area immediately after failing the test or as soon thereafter as scheduling allows. It is never later than the following semester. The student remains in remediation until (s)he passes the test(s).

3. The MCT program objectives are well organized and clearly defined. A manual is published and updated periodically. It describes the total program with its attendent requirement. This manual is available to all staff members.

4. A majority of the teaching staff was dissatisfied with the program. Results from a survey in May 1985 showed staff comments indicating that a majority of the teachers felt that the goal was being met, but felt that standards for the program were too low and should be raised. Other comments were: make curricular changes to make writing a subject matter area, smaller remedial classes are needed, and should return to basics. The latter comments were made by respondents in smaller percentages.

Recommendations Regarding the Program

Gary school officials should develop methods to identify students earlier who need remediation. The earlier remediation begins the better the chances for reducing the deficit the child will accumulate.

Writing should be introduced into the curriculum as a separate subject area.

The standard of sixth grade level of competency is too low and should be raised.

Gary school officials should embark upon an in-depth study to determine the strengths and weaknesses of the MCT Program.

Studies should be undertaken to determine what curriculum changes should be made based on information gathered during the years MCT has been operational.

A study to determine how many and what type students fail competency tests more than once would provide some important information for curriculum improvement.

Gary Public Schools competency requirements should be based on national norms rather than local norms. Therefore, students should be required to meet requirements based on scores made on a national standardized test.

Recommendations for Further Study

A study should be undertaken to determine what effect the Gary MCT Program has had on the scores of Gary students on National Standardized Tests.

Studies should be attempted to determine if appropriate standardized tests are being administered to Gary Public School students.

Since the Gary Public School System student

population has undergone a radical racial/ethnic transition during the past twenty years, studies should be undertaken to determine if tests presently being administered are appropriate.

A study should be made to determine if the Gary MCT Program should be maintained as it presently exists.

A comparative study of existing MCT Programs should be attempted. A study of this type would provide essential information for other school systems that are planning to implement MCT Programs.

LIST OF REFERENCES

Acheson, K. A. "Developing Competency based Graduation Requirements: Tips and Guidelines for School Districts, " Thrust for Educational Leadership. November, 1975.

American College Testing Program Research Report. Declining Admissions Test Scores. Iowa City, Iowa: American College Testing Program, Research and Development Division, 1976.

Angoff, W. (Ed.) The College Board Admissions Testing Program: A Technical Report on Research and Development Activities Relating to the Scholastic Aptitude Test and Achievement Tests. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1971.

Anttonen, R. G. and Elyse, S. F. "Standardized Test Information, Does It Make a Difference in Black Student Performance?" Journal of Educational Research, September - October, 1976.

Arkin, H. and Colton, R. R. Tables for Statisticians (2nd Ed.) College Outline Series. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1962.

Association of California School Administrators Special Report. The Hart Act. January 1977.

Ausubel, D. P. and Ausubel, P. Ego Development Among Segregated Negro Children. In Passow, Harry, A. (Ed.) Education in Depressed Areas. Teachers College, Columbia University, 1963.

Ayers, L. Laggards in Our Schools New York: Rusel Sage Foundation, 1909 (as cited in Weintraub, 1966).

Bailey, S. K., Macey, F. U., and Vickers, D. F. Alternate Paths to the High School Diploma. Reston, Virginia: The National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1973.

Ballachey, E. L., Crutchfield, R., and Krech, D. Individual in Society. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962.

Barton, A. H. Social Class and Instructional Procedures in the Process of Learning to Read, in New Developments in Programs and Procedures for College-Adult Reading (edited by Ralph Staiger and Culbreath Melton). Twelfth Yearbook of National Reading Conference, 1963.

Barzun, Jacques, The Modern Researcher. New York, Harcourt Brace, 1970.

Bentzen, F. "Sex Ratios in Learning and Behavior Disorders." National Elementary Principal, November 1966, p. 13-17.

Bereiter, C. and Engleman, S. Teaching Disadvantaged Children in Preschool. New Jersey: Engelwood Cliffs, Prentice-Hall, 1966.

Bernstein, B. "Language and Social." British Journal of Sociology 11 (1960): 271-276.

Berry, M. Statement Presented Before the Committee on Education and Labor, U. S. House of Representatives; Washington, D. C. September 15, 1977.

Bledsoe, J. "An Investigation of Six Correlates of Student Withdrawal from High School." Journal of Educational Research 53 (September 1959): 3-6.

Bloch, Marc. The Historian's Craft, New York, A. A. Knopf, 1953.

Bloom. B. S. Human Characteristics and School Learning. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1976.

Bloom, B. S., Hastings, J. T. and Mandaus, G. F. Handbook on Formative and Summative Evaluation of Student Learning. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

Bloom, B. S., et. al. A Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: Workbook I, The Cognitive Domain. New York: David McKay Co., Inc. 1956.

Bobbitt, F. How to Make a Curriculum. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The Riverside Press, Houghton-Mifflin, 1924.

Brademas, J. "Accountability: A Rationale," Congressional Record. December 10, 1973, 40590.

Brinckell, H. "Seven Key Notes on Minimum Competency Testing." Phi Delta Kappan 59 (May 1978): 589-92.

Briggs vs Kerigan; 307 F. Supp. 295 (D. Mass., 1969), Aff'd 431 F. 2d 967 (1970).

Brodinsky, B. "Back to the Basics: The Movement and Its Meaning." Phi Delta Kappan 58 (March 1977): 523-592.

Brown vs. Board of Education, 347 U. S. 483 (1954).

Bruininks, R. H. "Measures of Intelligence, Language Creativity, Reading and Written Language Achievement of Disadvantaged." In Figurel, J. A. (Ed.) Reading Goals for the Disadvantaged. Neward, Delaware: International Reading Association, 1970.

Buelke, J. A. "The Case for an Honest Diploma," Michigan Education Journal 33 (May 1956): 416-418.

Burns Indians Statues Annotated Code Edition, John E. Carrol (Ed.) New York: Bobbs-Merrill, 1974.

Buros, O. Fifth Mental Measurements Yearbooks. Highland Park, New Jersey: Gryphore Press, 1959.

Butler, E. H. "School Achievement and Attendance." School Review 33 (June 1925): 450-452.

Calkins, Lucy M. "'I Am One Who Writes' New Approaches to Children's Writing," American Educator, Fall, 1985, p. 26.

Callahan, R. E. Education and the Cult of Efficiency. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962.

Carr, Edward H. What is History? Alfred Knopf, 1962.

Cawelti, G. "National Competency Testing; A Bogus Solution." Phi Delta Kappan 59 (May 1978): 620.

Chandler, T. A. "Reading Disability and Socio-economic Status." Journal of Reading 10 (1966): 5-21.

Clark, J. P. and Thompson, S. D. Competency Test and Graduation Requirements. Reston, Virginia: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1976.

Coleman, J. et. al. Equality of Educational Opportunity. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1966.

Combs, A. Educational Accountability: Beyond Behavioral Objectives. Washington, D. C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1972.

Conant, J. B. Slums and Suburbs. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961.

Cooper, B. "An Analysis of the Reading Achievement of White and Negro Pupils in Certain Public Schools of Georgia." School Review 72 (Winter, 1964): 462-71.

Corwin, R. A Sociology of Education. New York: Appleton-Century Crofts, 1965.

Council for Basic Education. "Competency Testing to Date." Bulletin 22 (October 1977): 9-10.

Criscuolo, N. "Sex Influences on Reading." Reading Teacher 21 (May 1968): 762-764.

Davis, A. Child Training and Social Class in Children's Behavior and Development. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1943.

Day, M. a. "A Funny Thing Happened on the Way to a College Education." The Humanist 37 (July/August 1977): 23-26.

Deutsch, C. P. "Auditory Discrimination and Learning: Social Factors." Merrill-Palmer Quarterly 10 (1964): 277-296.

Deutsch, C. P. Learning in the Disadvantaged, in H. J. Klausmeier and C. W. Harris (Eds). Analyses of Concept Learning. New York: Academic Press, 1966.

Deutsch, M. Nursery Education: The Influence of Social Pro-gramming of Early Development. In Deutsch, M., Bloom, R. D ., Deutsch, C. P., Goldstein, L. S., John, V. P., Katz, P. A., Levinson, A., Petsach, E. C., and Whiteman, M. The Disadvantaged Child. New York: Basic Books, 1967.

Diederich, P. B. "Design for a Comprehensive Evaluation Program." The School Review 58 (April 1950): 225-232.

Doe vs. San Francisco Unified School District Civ. Act #653-312; Superior Court, San Francisco City Complaint Filed, November 20, 1972.

Donion, T. F. and Angoff, W. H. The scholastic Aptitude Test. In The College Board Admissions Testing Program: A Technical Report on Research and Development Activities Relating to the SAT and Achievement Tests. Edited by Angoff, H. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1971.

Donovan, B. Survey of Reading Abilities of Pupils Entering the Academic High schools. New York: Board of Education, 1955.

Dwyer, C. A. "Sex Differences in Reading: An Evaluation and Critique of Current Theories." Review of Educational Research 43, 455-467.

Dyer, H. "How to Achieve Accountability in the Public Schools." PDK Fastback series 35 (1973) Bloomington: Phi Delta Kappan.

Ebel, R. L. "Declining Scores: A Conservative Explanation." Phi Delta Kappan 58 (December 1976): 306-308.

Elford, G. A Review of Policy Issues Related to Competency Testing for High School Graduation. May 5, 1977; Manchester, New Hampshire. Paper presented before the New England Education Research Organization.

Fantini, Mario and Weinstein. The Disadvantaged. New York: Harper and Roe Publishers, 1968.

French, W. "What Should Graduation from the Secondary School Mean?" Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals 24 (December 1940): 46-50.

Gary Community School Corporation. Ratio of Indigent Students to School Membership on December 1, 1977. Pupil Personnel Department. February 15, 1978.

Gary Community School Corporation Research Department Report, Test Score Summaries.

Gilman, D. A. "Minimum Competency Testing: An Insurance Policy for Survival Skills. NASSP Bulletin 61 (March 1977): 77-84.

Gilman, D. A. The Complex Logic of MCT and Survival Schools. Unpublished Paper, Indiana State University, 1978, 1-5.

Glass, G. V. "Minimum Competence and Incompetence in Florida." Phi Delta Kappan 59 (May 1978): 602-605.

Glickman, J. Review of Research: Sex Differences in Intellectual Functioning. Paper presented at the Annual meeting of the International Reading Association. 21st, Anaheim, California; May 12, 1976.

Goldberg, M. A. "Factors Affecting Educational Attainment in Passow, H. A." (Ed.), Education in Depressed Areas. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1963, 68-99.

Golladay, M. A. The Condition of Education: A Statistical Report on the Condition of Education in the U. S. (Annual Report of the National Center for Education Statistics, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, publication No. NCES 76-400). Washington, D. C. U. S. Government Printing Office, 1976.

Gough, H. G. "Relationship of Socio-Economic Status to Personality Inventory and Achievement Tests Survey." Journal of Educational Psychology 37 (1947): 527-540.

Graham, P. A. "American's Unsystematic Education System." American Education 14 (July 1974).

Grambs, J. B. and Waetjen, W. S. "Being Equally Different: A new Right for Boys and Girls." National Elementary Principal November 1966, 56-67.

Hanson, E. H. "A Fetish: The High School Diploma." Education 79 (December 1959): 262-265.

Hartung, M. C. "Education for Living." The School Review 50 (March 1942): 173-174.

Haskins, R. W. "What Should a High School Offer?" The School Executive 59 (May 1938): 407; 442.

Havighurst, R. J. "Characteristics of the Disadvantaged." Journal of Negro Education 33 (Summer 1964): 210-217.

Hecht, K. "Teacher Ratings of Potential Dropouts and Academic Gifted Children." Journal of Teacher Education 26 (1975): 172-173.

Henry, A. "Foundations of General Education in the High School." In, What Shall the High School Teach? Yearbook of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Washington, D. C.: ASCD, 1956. 127-175.

Hill, E. H. and Giammatteo, M. C. "Socio-Economic Status and Its Relationship to School Achievement in Elementary School." Elementary English 40 (1963): 265-270.

Hoock, William. Personal Interview. Director of Research Gary Community School Corporation. December 6, 1984.

Huber, J. "Hangers of Misapplication." NASSP Bulletin 58 (September 1974): 15.

Hughes, H. Stuart. History as Art and Science. Harper and Row, 1964.

Indiana Department of Public Instruction. Indiana Comprehensive Assessment and Program Planning System. Indiananapolis, Indiana, 1978.

Jacklin, C. N. and Macoby, E. E. Sex Differences in Intellectual Abilities: A Reassessment and a Look at Some New Explanations. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, April 1972.

James, T. H. The new Cult of Efficiency and Education. Pittsburgh: Pittsburgh University Press, 1968. 293-295.

Jenne, F. "Attendance and Student Proficiency Changes in a Health Science Class." Journal of School Health 43 (1973): 125-126.

Jencks, C. "Inequality in Retrospect." Perspectives on Inequality. Harvard Educational Review Reprint Series No. 8, 1973, 103.

Jennings, W. and Nathan, J. "Graduation Competencies -- More than a Fad." North Central Association Quarterly 52 (Fall 1977): 316-320.

Jontz, J. "Indiana State Representative." Basic Skills Achievement Legislation. Introduced in Indiana House of Representatives on December 7, 1977, Indianapolis, Indiana.

Karweit, N. "A Re-analysis of the Effect of Schooling on Achievement." Sociology of Education 49 (July 1976): 236-245.

Kazalunas, John. NASSP 62 (October 1978): 62.

Keefe, J. W. and Georgiades, C. J. "Competency Based Education and the High School Diploma." NASSP Bulletin 62 (April 1978): 94-108.

Keyes, V. Denver School District Number 1. 41 L. W. 5002 (U. S. S. Court, 1973).

Kiernan, O. B. Forward in James P. Clark and Scott Thompson, Competency Tests and Graduation Requirements. NASSP, 1976.

Kirch, T. and Guthrie, J. T. "The Concept and Measurement Functional Literacy." Reading Research Quarterly 13 (1977-78): 505.

Krathwohl, D. R., et. al. Taxonomy of Educational Objectives Handbook II: Affective Domain. New York: David McKay Co., Inc. 1964.

Leake, J. "Denver Graduates Come Up to PAR." NEA Journal 52 (November 1963): 24-25.

Leibson, B. "Diplomas are Obsolete." High Points 39 (November 1957): 37-41.

Lessinger, L. "Engineering Accountability for Results in Public Education." Phi Delta Kappan 52 (December 1970): 217.

Lessinger, L. Every Kid A Winner: Accountability in Education. Palto Alto, California: Science Research Association, 1970.

Levin, H. M. "A Conceptual Framework for Accountability in Education." The School Review 82 (May 1974): 363.

Macoby, E. E. and Jacklin, C. N. The Psychology of Sex Differences. Stanford California: Stanford University Press, 1974.

McAndrew, Gordon. Basic Skills Competence. Memorandum to Division Heads and District Administrators. February 26, 1974.

McClung, M. S. "Competency Testing: Potential for Discrimination." Clearing House Review. September 1977, 439-448.

McComas, J. D. "Accountability: How Do We Measure Up?" Educational Technology 31 (June 1971).

Minutes of Board of School Trustees Meeting. September 17, 1974.

Morgan, R . "An Exploratory Study of Three Procedures to Encourage School Attendance." Psychology in the Schools 12 (1975): 209-215.

Motl, R., U. S. Congressman (D), Ohio, Introduced H. R. 9374 in the House of Representatives, October 14, 1977.

Mumpower, D. D. "Sex Ratios Found in Various Types of Referred Exceptional Children." Exceptional Child 36 (April 1970): 621-622.

Nachman, L, Getsion, R., and Odgers, R. Pilot Study of Ohio High School Drop-outs, 1961-1962. Columbus, Ohio: State Department of Education, 1963.

Nance, W. R. "How Fares Competency Development in Oregon?" Educational Leadership 35 (November 1977): 102-104.

National Assessment of Educational Progress. What Students Know and Can Do: Profiles of Three Age Groups. Denver, Colorado: Education Commission of the States, March 1975.

National Association of Secondary School Principals. "School Attendance and Absenteeism." The Practicioner. March 1975.

National Association of Secondary School Principals. This We Believe 39 (1975): 43-44.

National Commission on Technology, Automation and Economic Progress. Technology and the American Economy 1 (1966). Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office.

National Institute of Education. Declining Test Scores. Washington, D. C., February 1976.

Neighbours, O. J. "Retardation in the Schools and Some of the Causes.": Elementary School Teacher 11 (1910): 119-135.

Neil, S. B. (Ed.) The Competency Movement: Problems and Solution. Arlington, Virginia: American Association of School Administrators Critical Issues Report, 1978, 5-8; 25.

Nevins, Allan. Gateway to History. Doubleday, 1962.

Nixon, R. Education Message 1970. LT 313 L & T T5 Loyola.

Northcutt, N. Adult Functional Competency: A Summary. Austin: The University of Texas, Division of Extension, March 1975.

On Further Examination: Report of the Advisory Panel in the Scholastic Aptitude Test Score Decline. (Willard Wirtz, Chairman). New Jersey: College Entrance Examination Board, 1977.

Ornstein, A. C. "The Politics of Accountability." The Clearing House 69 (September 1975): 5-10.

Owens, S. and Ranick, D. "The Greensville Program: A Common Sense Approach to Basics." Phi Delta Kappan 58 (March 1977): 531-533.

Patten, S. N. "An Economic Measure of School Efficiency." Educational Review 61 (May 1911): 467-477.

Patton, N. "Seven Cardinal Principles of Education Revisited." In, New Dimension for Educating Youth: A Report on America's Secondary Schools. Reston, Virginia: U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and NASSP, 1976.

Peltier, G. L. "Sex Differences in the School: Problem and Proposed Solution." Phi Delta Kappan 50 (November 1968): 182.

Pfeiffer, John. New Look at Education. New York: Odyssey Press, 1968.

Pine, G. J. "Teacher Accountability: Myths and Realities." Educational Forum 40 (November 1976): 49-60.

Pipho, C. "What Does the Diploma Mean?" In, New Dimensions for Educating Youth. Washington, D. C., U. S. Government Printing Office (U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and National Association of Secondary Principals, 1976): 53-54.

Pipho, C. "Minimum Competency Testing in 1978: A Look at State Standards." Phi Delta Kappan 59 (May 1978): 587-588.

Pipho, C. Update VI: Minimal Competence Testing. Denver: Education Commission of the States, June 1, 1977.

Pipho, C. Update VII: Minimum Competence Testing. Denver: Educational Commission of the States, November 15, 1977.

Popham, W. J. Address before NAEP Conference on Large Scale Assessment, June 13-16, 1977, Boulder, Colorado.

Powell, M., O'Conner, H., and Parsely, K. "Further Investigation of Sex Differences in Achievement of Underachievers and Overachieving Students with 5 IQ Groups in Grades 4-8. Journal of Educational Research 57 (1964): 268-270.

Quade, Edward S. (Ed.) Analysis for Military Decisions Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1967.

Ratner, G. M. "Remedying Failure to Teach Basic Skills: Preliminary Thoughts." Inequality in Education: No. 17, Harvard University Center for Law and Education, June 1974.

Renier, C. J. History Its Purpose and Method. Harper and Company, 1976.

Rice, A. A. "Good Teachers Stand to Benefit from Accountability Plans." Nation's Schools 16 (November 1970): 86.

Richmond, D. B. "Let's Get Rid of the High School Diploma." The National Observer 24 (November 27, 1976).

Ricken, R. "An Original Thesis as a Diploma Requirement." New York State Education 50 (October 1962): 38; 46.

Robbins, J. A Summary of Selected Major Studies Which Associate Input and Output Variables with various Measures of School Quality and Output. University of Arkansas at Little Rock, Division of Education, 1975.

Roth, E. "APL: A Ferment in Education." American Education 12 (May 1976): 6-9.

Roueche, J. E. "What is College Level? Or Why Can't College Students Read and Write?" The Clearing House 50 (April 1977): 332.

Rowse, A. L. The Use of History. MacMillan, 1948.

Rucker, C., Beggs, D., Gustafson, R., Paulus, D., and Roby, W. Achievement and Related School Factors in the Largest Cities in Connecticut. Hartford: Connecticut State Department of Education, Office of Program Development, Connecticut University, April, 1970. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. Ed. 080613.

Ryan, J. and French, J. R. "Long Term Grade Predictors for Intelligence and Achievement Tests in School with Differing SES Levels." Education and Psychological Measurement 36 (Summer 1976): 553-559.

Seannell, D. P. "Prediction of College Success from Elementary and Secondary School Performance." Journal of Educational Psychology 51 (1960): 130-134.

Schfield, D. "Issues in Basic Education." School Leadership Digest. Reston, Virginia: National Association of Elementary School Principals, 1976, Second Series, No. 12.

Scriven, Michael S. "The Methodology of Evaluation." AERA Monograph Series on Curriculum Evaluation, Book I. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1967.

Sexton, P. T. "Schools are Emasculating our Boys." Education Digest 31 (November 1965): 32-33.

Sizer, Theodore. Places for Learning, Places for Joy. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973.

Sommerville, J. An investigation of the relationship between school organizational climate and self concept, level of aspiration, attitude and opinion of students about school. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Michigan, 1969.

Spacy, W. "Competency Based Education: A Band Wagon in Search of Definition." Education Researcher 6 (January 1977).

Spacy, W. G. and Mitchell, D. E. "Competency Based Education: Organizational Issues and Implications. Educational Researcher 6 (February 1977): 9-15.

Spaulding, F. T. "Three Problems for High School Principals." Bulletin of National Association of Secondary Principals 23 (December 1939): 9-11.

Stake, Robert E. "The Countenance of Educational Evaluation." Teachers College Record. Columbia University. New York. April 1967.

Strike, K. "What is a Competence High School Graduate?" Educational Leadership 35 (November 1977): 93.

Stroud, J. B. and Lindquist, E. F. "Sex Differences in Achievement in Elementary and Secondary Schools." Journal of Educational Psychology 33 (1942): 657-667.

Suchman, Edward A. Evaluative Research. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1967.

Thiel, W. Trends in Accountability and Educational Assessment Through Legislative Action. Doctoral Dissertation, Loyola University, Chicago: November, 1975, 9.

Thompson, S. D. "Before You Hand Out Those Diplomas: Should Your Students Prove They've Learned Something?" American School Board Journal, March 1977, 41-43.

Thorndike, Robert L. and Hagen, Elizabeth. Measurement and Evaluation in Psychology and Education. John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York, 1955. 1-2.

Toffler, Alvin. The Third Wave. William Morrow and Company, Inc. New York. 1980.

Turner, G. Summary of city-wide test 12th grade results 1976-77. Gary, Indiana: School City of Gary, June 1977.

U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. National Health Survey: Literacy Among Youth 12-17 years. Rockville, Maryland: Public Health Service, National Center for Health Statistics, Series 11, No. 131, H. E. 20, 6209.

U. S. Department of Labor. Manpower Report of the President. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1965.

Valente, William D. Law in the Schools. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co. 1980.

Van Denburg, J. K. Causes of Elimination in the Public Secondary Schools of New York. Bureau of Publications Teachers College, Columbia University, 1941.

Van Geel, T. "Does The Constitution Establish a Right to an Education?" The School Review 82 (February 1974): 293.

Venn, G. Man, Education and Work. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education. 1964.

Walberg, N. "Urban Schooling and Delinquency." American Educational Research Journal 9 (1972): 285-300.

Walker, D. F. Editorial: "The Hard Lot of the Professional in a Reform Movement." Educational Leadership 35 (November 1977): 83-85.

Weaver, S. J. and Weaver, A. "Psycholinguistic Abilities of Culturally Deprived Negro Children." American Journal of Mental Deficiency 72 (1967): 190-197.

Weingartner, C. "Basic Backwardness." Arizona English Bulletin 18 (February 1976): 139-144.

Whitmore, P. and Chapman, R. Drop-out Incident and Significance at Modesto High School, 1961-64. Modesto, California: Modesto Public School, 1965.

Wiley, D. and Harnischfeger, A. Explosion of a Myth: Quality of Schooling and Exposure to Instruction, Major Educational Vehicles. University of Chicago, Studies of Educative Processes, Report #8, 1974.

Wilson, M. D., Loffreds, M., and Tompkins, J. A Study of Achievement Variables Among Six Grade Students in the Des Moines Independent Community School District 1974-75. Des Moines Public Schools, Department of Evaluation, April 19, 1976 (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. Ed. 134615).

Wolf, Richard M. Evaluation In Education: Foundations of Competency Assessment and Program Review. Praeger Publishers, New York, 1979.

Wolfbein, S. C. "Education and Employment in Eli Ginzberg's The Nation's Children. New York: Columbia University Press, 1960.

APPENDIX

LOYOLA UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

*Water Tower Campus * 820 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Illinois 60611 * (312) 670-3030*

May 1, 1985

To The Respondent:

I am presently working on my doctoral dissertation. The topic of my investigation involves the Minimum Competency Program of the Gary, Indiana Community School Corporation.

The procedure being employed in this study requires that the question of whether the program is meeting its goal be answered. One method of gaining insight to this question is by using an opinion survey. I am seeking your help by asking you to give your unbiased opinion of the items listed on the questionnaire.

In order for the study to accurately reflect opinions of all participants, your return of the questionnaire is urgently needed. It will require approximately five minutes of your time to complete the form.

Your participation in this important study will be greatly appreciated. Thank you for your time and cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

William S. Demby, Jr.

In February of 1974, the Superintendent of Schools, Dr. Gordon McAndrew, proposed that every student attending the Gary Public School System demonstrate basic skills proficiency before receiving a high school diploma. (adopted by the Board of School Trustees, September 1974)

QUESTIONNAIRE

	NO	YES	UNSURE
1. Do you think that the Basic Skills Program is meeting its goal?	____	____	____
2. Do you think that the program would achieve more significant gains were it to be modified or changed?	____	____	____

COMMENTS: Please comment on how the program should be changed if you answered "yes" to number two.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Percent of Students Passing the Reading Proficiency Exam
by the end of the school years indicated

Grade 10 Schools	1978-79	1979-80	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	1983-84
Horace Mann	84.8	84.3	85.9	77.0	83.2	82.8
Lew Wallace	92.5	91.2	90.0	89.0	88.1	83.8
Roosevelt	93.1	86.9	92.1	88.2	86.8	91.3
West Side	88.9	91.2	88.3	91.6	89.9	91.4
Wirt	92.8	88.6	93.2	90.3	94.3	93.9
Citywide	91.0	86.9	89.1	87.4	89.3	87.9

Grade 11 Schools	1978-79	1979-80	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	1983-84
Horace Mann	93.8	97.3	95.0	93.9	90.7	93.1
Lew Wallace	98.5	98.6	96.6	98.3	94.1	96.0
Roosevelt	97.7	98.4	96.2	98.2	95.1	97.9
West Side	96.4	98.8	95.8	98.8	96.0	97.9
Wirt	98.8	98.3	97.6	97.4	95.5	95.6
Citywide	97.0	93.9	94.3	96.4	95.1	95.9

Grade 12 Schools	1978-79	1979-80	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	1983-84
Horace Mann	99.3	99.0	98.7	99.3	100.0	100.0
Lew Wallace	99.8	98.6	99.7	99.5	100.0	100.0
Roosevelt	99.2	98.9	98.7	99.6	100.0	98.8
West Side	99.0	99.4	99.4	99.8	99.5	100.0
Wirt	95.2	99.5	99.5	100.0	100.0	100.0
Citywide	98.4	99.0	98.8	99.4	99.8	99.9

Percent of Students Passing the Mathematics Proficiency Exam
by the end of the school years indicated

Grade 10 Schools	1978-79	1979-80	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	1983-84
Horace Mann	79.3	79.3	81.4	77.4	84.4	84.6
Lew Wallace	89.0	88.3	90.5	88.8	88.3	80.8
Roosevelt	87.6	89.3	89.8	90.0	89.8	90.9
West Side	87.9	92.2	89.0	89.6	87.9	90.2
Wirt	92.1	85.8	94.5	92.4	93.2	93.9
Citywide	87.1	85.0	88.5	87.5	89.5	87.2

Grade 11 Schools	1978-79	1979-80	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	1983-84
Horace Mann	93.8	94.3	94.6	91.1	88.9	92.6
Lew Wallace	98.5	97.3	98.0	98.0	95.6	94.9
Roosevelt	97.7	96.5	96.6	97.0	95.1	97.7
West Side	96.4	97.7	96.6	98.8	94.8	95.5
Wirt	98.8	97.0	98.1	97.8	96.6	96.1
Citywide	94.6	91.8	95.2	95.5	95.2	95.2

Grade 12 Schools	1978-79	1979-80	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	1983-84
Horace Mann	99.3	99.6	99.9	98.2	99.2	99.0
Lew Wallace	99.8	98.8	99.7	98.9	100.0	100.0
Roosevelt	98.0	98.9	99.6	99.6	99.8	100.0
West Side	99.3	99.1	99.6	99.6	98.8	99.7
Wirt	95.2	99.5	99.5	100.0	99.6	100.0
Citywide	98.0	98.9	99.2	99.0	99.4	99.8

Percent of Students Passing the Written Proficiency Exam
by the end of the School Years Indicated

Grade 10 Schools	1978-79	1979-80	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	1983-84
Horace Mann	67.3	57.7	63.1	56.2	74.2	73.6
Lew Wallace	86.4	79.7	76.0	73.8	79.0	67.3
Roosevelt	81.8	77.2	75.0	68.5	72.1	75.5
West Side	81.5	85.7	76.2	73.3	73.1	78.7
Wirt	83.9	78.3	76.1	79.3	83.8	77.3
Citywide	79.6	73.7	73.2	69.8	75.9	73.0

Grade 11 Schools	1978-79	1979-80	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	1983-84
Horace Mann	83.9	85.0	79.2	75.7	78.7	87.6
Lew Wallace	95.7	95.5	90.8	95.7	92.9	91.2
Roosevelt	92.4	94.5	93.7	90.8	87.3	91.1
West Side	92.1	97.0	95.2	93.4	90.5	90.5
Wirt	95.1	95.3	96.2	92.9	93.8	92.2
Citywide	91.9	93.3	89.9	88.8	90.0	89.5

Grade 12 Schools	1978-79	1979-80	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	1983-84
Horace Mann	95.9	99.6	97.6	91.9	96.7	99.0
Lew Wallace	97.5	98.6	98.1	97.9	98.9	100.0
Roosevelt	95.4	98.9	97.1	96.9	96.5	99.4
West Side	96.8	99.4	98.4	97.9	96.1	99.5
Wirt	91.8	99.5	99.1	98.7	98.5	100.0
Citywide	96.6	97.7	96.9	96.3	96.4	99.6

Percent of Students Passing the Oral Proficiency Exam
by the End of the School Years Indicated

Grade 10 Schools	1978-79	1979-80	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	1983-84
Horace Mann	74.6	60.7	69.7	76.3	82.0	78.8
Lew Wallace	73.2	82.5	78.7	76.0	72.0	77.4
Roosevelt	72.0	79.8	79.0	81.0	79.3	71.0
West Side	70.1	74.5	77.2	82.3	77.2	76.1
Wirt	76.0	76.8	81.5	85.1	88.3	87.5
Citywide	71.9	72.1	76.3	79.5	79.1	76.0

Grade 11 Schools	1978-79	1979-80	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	1983-84
Horace Mann	90.9	94.0	90.3	90.0	92.0	97.2
Lew Wallace	89.2	94.8	95.1	94.0	90.0	89.0
Roosevelt	94.2	93.7	92.8	96.8	93.9	94.3
West Side	82.9	93.5	91.2	93.8	94.8	91.7
Wirt	88.5	94.4	93.8	95.1	97.3	91.3
Citywide	85.5	89.2	91.0	92.5	94.9	91.5

Grade 12 Schools	1978-79*	1979-80	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	1983-84
Horace Mann		98.1	99.3	99.6	100.0	99.0
Lew Wallace		98.0	98.4	97.6	100.0	100.0
Roosevelt		98.7	97.1	99.6	99.8	99.8
West Side		97.7	98.2	99.1	98.8	99.7
Wirt		98.2	99.1	99.6	100.0	100.0
Citywide		97.8	97.7	98.8	99.6	99.8

*Oral Proficiency Not Required - "78-'79

W. Hoock
June '84

SECONDARY TESTING SCHEDULE - 1984-85

FALL

NAME OF TEST	DATE	GRADE
Tests of Achievement and Proficiency (Reading, Math and Language)	October 8 - 12	11
Written Proficiency Exam (Essay and Objective)	November 26 - 30	10 thru 12
Reading Proficiency Exam	December 3 - 7	10 thru 12
Mathematics Proficiency Exam	December 10 - 14	10 thru 12
Oral Proficiency Exam	January 7 - 31	10 thru 12

SPRING

Tests of Achievement and Proficiency (Reading, Math, Language and Iowa - Spelling)	March 11 - 15	9
Tests of Achievement and Proficiency (for Remedial Reading only)	March 11 - 15	10
Tests of Achievement and Proficiency (Social Studies and Science)	March 18 - 22	11
Iowa Tests of Basic Skills (Vocabulary, Reading, Math and Language)	~~April 1 - 4~~ March 25-29	7
Iowa Tests of Basic Skills (Vocabulary, Reading, Math, Social Studies and Science)	April 22 - 26	8
Written Proficiency Exam (Essay and Objective)	April 22 - 26	10 thru 12
Mathematics Proficiency Exam	April 29 - May 3	10 thru 12
Reading Proficiency Exam	April 29 - May 3	10 thru 12
Oral Proficiency Exam	May 6 - 24	10 thru 12

W. Hoock
Sept. 1984

Approved: James H. Wooten
James H. Wooten
Assistant Superintendent

APPROVAL SHEET

The dissertation submitted by William Smith Demby, Jr. has been read and approved by the following committee:

Dr. Max A. Bailey, Director
Associate Professor, Administration and Supervision
Loyola

Dr. Philip M. Carlin
Associate Professor, Chairperson, Administration and Supervision, Loyola

Dr. Joan K. Smith
Associate Professor, Foundations and
Associate Dean, Graduate School, Loyola

The final copies have been examined by the director of the dissertation and the signature which appears below verifies the fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated and that the dissertation is now given final approval by the Committee with reference to content and form.

The dissertation is therefore accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education.

December 6, 1985
Date

Max A. Bailey
Director's Signature