

Eastern Illinois University

The Keep

Plan B Papers

Student Theses & Publications

1-1-1964

An Evaluation of the Present Grading System in Danville, Illinois Schools

Gary C. Rogers

Follow this and additional works at: https://thekeep.eiu.edu/plan_b

Recommended Citation

Rogers, Gary C., "An Evaluation of the Present Grading System in Danville, Illinois Schools" (1964). *Plan B Papers*. 304.

https://thekeep.eiu.edu/plan_b/304

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

AN EVALUATION OF THE PRESENT GRADING SYSTEM

IN DANVILLE, ILLINOIS SCHOOLS

(TITLE)

BY

Gary C. Rogers

PLAN B PAPER

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR
THE DEGREE MASTER OF SCIENCE IN EDUCATION
AND PREPARED IN COURSE

Education 580

IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL, EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY,
CHARLESTON, ILLINOIS

1964

YEAR

I HEREBY RECOMMEND THIS PLAN B PAPER BE ACCEPTED AS
FULFILLING THIS PART OF THE DEGREE, M.S. IN ED.

May 2, 1965
DATE

ADVISER

May 3, 1965
DATE

DEPARTMENT HEAD

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I most gratefully acknowledge my deep indebtedness to Dr. Curtis Garner, Professor of Education, Eastern Illinois University, at Charleston, Illinois, for his valuable criticisms and constructive suggestions on the entire paper. I am also grateful to parents and teachers in the Danville School System whose responses to questionnaires sent them provided me with much of the data contained in the paper, and to Mr. Guy Cornwell, Director of Education at Danville, Illinois, who furnished valuable information and assistance in the preparation of this paper.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	ii
LIST OF TABLES	iv
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
A Description of the Schools	
A Description of the Community	
The Problem Under Analysis	
II. AN EVALUATION OF THE GRADING SYSTEM	13
Variability or Uniformity of Grading	
Standards	
The Aims of the Present Grading System	
First Grade Teachers' and Parents'	
"Try-Out" of Conferences	
The "Grading" Committee	
How Parents and Teachers Feel About	
the "New" Report Card	
III. VALUE ANALYSIS OF THE PROBLEM	30
IV. RECOMMENDATIONS	40
APPENDIX	48
BIBLIOGRAPHY	58

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Comparison of Elementary Teacher Qualifications in Danville with Three Cities of Comparable Size	3
2. Comparison of Junior High Teacher Qualifications in Danville with Three Cities of Comparable Size	4
3. Comparison of High School Teacher Qualifications in Danville with Three Cities of Comparable Size	4
4. Qualifications of the Present Board of Education District 118	6
5. Average Grades of Franklin School Children, 1962-63	14
6. Grades of Franklin School Children According to Number in Each Subject Area . . .	14
7. Average Grades of Garfield School Children, 1962-63	15
8. Grades of Garfield School Children According to Number in Each Subject Area . . .	15
9. Average Grades of Northeast School Children, 1962-63	16
10. Grades of Northeast School Children According to Number in Each Subject Area . . .	16
11. Median Grades (Grades 3 to 6)	17
12. Percentage of Each Letter Grade Given in Reading	18
13. Comparison of an Area of "Most Supervision" with an Area of "Least Supervision" . . .	20

14.	Comparison of a Fixed Standard Area with Social Studies	20
15.	Comparison between a Self-Contained Fifth Grade Classroom at Garfield and a Depart- mentalized Fifth Grade Classroom at Northeast	22

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A description of the schools.--Danville School District 118 is the subject of the following case analysis in educational administration. The district was organized in March, 1920, and has been enlarged over the years. Presently, it is composed of about thirty-two square miles and is larger than the city of Danville.

District 118 is a unit district. The public schools consist of twelve grades on a 6-3-3 plan plus a two-year junior college. All children living in District 118 are entitled to attend the seventeen elementary schools, three junior high schools, and the senior high school tuition free. All Illinois residents are charged a tuition fee per credit hour by the junior college. Equal educational opportunities must be provided for all persons from ages six to twenty-one.

Special educational facilities are also provided for the multiply handicapped, visually handicapped, mentally handicapped, homebound students, physically handicapped, and the trainable. Classes for these students are held throughout the city wherever available facilities exist.

¹Danville Digest of Local Government (Danville, Illinois: League of Women Voters, 1963), pp. 35-36.

The total number of students enrolled in the district as of March 2, 1964, was 10,439.² They are housed in twenty-one buildings, as the junior college is housed in the senior high school building and pays rent for its use. The schools operate nine months of the year and must be in session 176 days to comply with state requirements and receive state aid. The district is, at present, accredited by the Office of the State Department of Public Instruction at all levels and by the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools at the senior high level.³

The school staff is composed of 210 elementary and junior high school instructors, 141 high school teachers, thirty-seven junior college teachers, and eighteen special education instructors. In addition, the following supervisors and consultants are employed:⁴

Elementary Curriculum Supervisor

Elementary Music Consultant

Technical and Vocational Education
Director

Physical Education Supervisor

Music Supervisor

Foreign Language Supervisor

Pupil Personnel Supervisor

²See Appendix One.

³See Appendix Two.

⁴See Appendix Three.

Audio-visual and Library Supervisor
 Language Arts Elementary Consultant
 Director of Instruction
 Guidance Director
 Guidance Counselors (3)

As a basis of comparison of staff qualifications of the Danville School District Personnel with the personnel of three other Illinois cities of comparable size, the following tables are offered. This information was obtained from Mr. G. E. Cornwell, Director of Instruction, Danville Public Schools. They are included in an only-copy of a study made of four Illinois cities of comparable size. The study is on file in Mr. Cornwell's office and can be verified by him. He requested that the names of the other three cities not be listed in this report. Therefore, they are referred to as Schools 1, 2, and 3.⁵

TABLE 1

COMPARISON OF ELEMENTARY TEACHER QUALIFICATIONS IN
 DANVILLE WITH THREE CITIES OF COMPARABLE SIZE

	No Degree	B. S.	M. S. or more
School 1	0	75%	25%
School 2	0	59%	41%
School 3	3%	68%	29%
Danville	16%	62%	22%

⁵Interview with Guy Cornwell, Director of Instruction, Danville Public Schools, January 28, 1964.

TABLE 2

COMPARISON OF JUNIOR HIGH TEACHER QUALIFICATIONS IN
DANVILLE WITH THREE CITIES OF COMPARABLE SIZE

	No Degree	B. S.	M. S. or more
School 1	0	57%	43%
School 2	0	34%	66%
School 3	0	41%	59%
Danville	2%	59%	39%

TABLE 3

COMPARISON OF HIGH SCHOOL TEACHER QUALIFICATIONS IN
DANVILLE WITH THREE CITIES OF COMPARABLE SIZE

	B. S.	M. S. or more
School 1	31%	69%
School 2	23%	77%
School 3	41%	59%
School 4 (Danville)	37%	63%

The following facts and figures help to illustrate conditions in and quality of the system. They are indicative as of January, 1964.⁶

1. Kindergarten programs: None
2. Number of pupils per teacher: Elementary, 27;
Junior high, 23; High school, 27.4

⁶Ibid.

3. Square feet of classroom per pupil:
Elementary, 33; Junior high, 30;
High school, 39
4. Drop-outs in one year: 34%
5. Pilot programs during past five
years: 2
6. Senior high curriculum offerings: 85
7. Per cent of graduates who go on to
college: 45-48%
8. Number of high school students per
counselor: 878
9. Average salary of teachers: \$7000-
\$7500
10. Salary schedule: B. S. - Min. \$4900,
Max. \$6500; M. S. - Min. \$5000,
Max. \$7350
11. Teacher turnover (1963): 20.28%
12. Library books per pupil: Elementary,
2.6; Junior high, 11.3; High school,
7.8
13. Available audio-visual materials:
Movies, educational television,
film strips, recordings
14. Pay scale for principals: Elementary-
Min. \$6750, Max. \$9250; Junior high-
Min. \$10,000, Max. \$10,400; High
school-Min. \$12,000
15. Cost of new school construction: \$11
per square foot
16. Instructional costs per pupil: \$290
17. Total school budget: \$4,334,660 or
\$445 per pupil
18. Sources of school funds: Local, 51.06%;
State, 34.7%; Other, 14.18%
19. Assessed valuation (1962): \$12,307
per pupil; \$2,900 per capita
20. School tax rates: \$1.40 (1963)

School District 118 is governed locally by a Board of Education, composed of seven members, serving three-year staggered terms. The school board election is held the second Saturday in April. Members serve without compensation. Each year the new board elects a president and a secretary, the latter not a board member. The board has a regular monthly meeting which is open to the public. It makes policy decisions, issues an annual budget, has the

power to request a tax levy, and hires the superintendent. The following table provides additional information concerning the present members of the board.⁷

TABLE 4
QUALIFICATIONS OF THE PRESENT BOARD OF EDUCATION
DISTRICT 118

Member	Profession or Occupation	Level of Education	
		H. S.	College
One	Attorney		x
Two	Attorney		x
Three	Homebuilder-Engineer		x
Four	Chiropractor		x
Five	Sanitary district manager		Some
Six	Maintenance supervisor for chain of supermarkets	x	
Seven	Accountant for general contractor		Some

The curriculum for the Danville School District is devised largely by the Curriculum Coordinating Council under the supervision of the Director of Instruction. The Council is composed of eighteen members, two teachers from the lower elementary grades, two teachers from the intermediate grades, one teacher from special education, three teachers from the junior high grades, two teachers from the senior high, one elementary principal, one junior high principal, one representative from the secondary principal's office, one

⁷See Appendix 4.

consultant, one representative from the superintendent's office, and one member each from three community organizations determined by the Council. Meetings are held bi-monthly.

A description of the community.---Danville, Illinois, is a city of 41,856, according to the 1960 census. The county seat of Vermilion County, it is located in the eastern part of the state, six miles from the Indiana State Line, and 124.4 miles due south of Chicago. It covers an area of around eleven square miles, and has operated under the commission form of government since 1927. The responsibility for the executive, the administrative, and the legislative business of the city is vested in a City Council, elected by the voters on a non-partisan basis every four years.⁸

The following information throws light on the social structure of the city. Given are the resulting figures of the United States Census of Population in 1960 conducted by the Illinois Branch of the United States Department of Commerce.⁹

Population of Danville-41,856
 Per cent of increase (1950-1960)-10.5
 Per cent non-white-11.0
 Per cent under 18-34.3
 Per cent 65 and over-12.0
 Fertility ratio-486 children under 5
 per 1000 women

⁸Danville, Illinois (Danville: Danville Chamber of Commerce, 1963), p. 1.

⁹Ibid, p. 2.

Per cent married (Male, over 14)-74.2
 Per cent married (Female, over 14)-63.3
 Number of householders-13,918
 Per cent of increase in householders,
 (1950-1960)-13.6
 Population per household-2.97
 Per cent of total population in group
 quarters-1.2
 Population in group quarters-510
 Number of males in city-19,722
 Number of females in city-22,134
 Number non-white males-2,197
 Number white males-17,525
 Number non-white females-2,409
 Number white females-19,725
 Number of children under 18-14,366
 Number of children under 5-4,584
 Characteristics of the population

	Male	Female
White	17,525	19,725
Negroid	2,186	2,394
Indian	3	2
Japanese	1	2
Chinese	3	2
Filipino	1	2
Other races	3	7

Danville has approximately 150 industrial plants which employ over 16,000 and pay wages of \$67,000,000 annually.¹⁰ Principal manufactured products include paper boxes, industrial safety wearing apparel, garments, brick, hardware, ballasts for fluorescent lights, drag line buckets, bobby pins, lift trucks, casket hardware, specialty printing, "Chuckles" candy, fertilizers, artificial decorations, playground equipment, fireworks, industrial cereals, radiator hoses, automatic welding machines, castings, wood and metal products, electronic

¹⁰Ibid, p. 3.

equipment, dog food, vinegar, contact filters, air compressors, meat packing, strip coal mining, fabricated metal components, anti-freeze, oil lubricants, timing devices, commercial refrigeration and air-conditioning equipment, copper and canvas products, machine tools, chemicals, cellulose casings, crane conveyor equipment, corrugated containers, and steel fabrication.

In 1961, the assessed valuation of the city of Danville was \$100,090,673, and the bonded debt was \$1,305,000.¹¹ There are three national banks with a total of \$71,918,970 assets in March, 1963, and three savings and loan associations with a total of \$18,490,615 assets as of March, 1963.¹²

Danville's altitude is 611 feet above sea level. Its mean January temperature is 28, mean July temperature, 76. Other statistics include the following:

City parks-10
 Churches-92 (32 denominations)
 Newspapers-1 daily and Sunday
 Radio stations-3 (WITY, WDAN, WFBI*FM)
 TV stations-1 (WCID)
 Motels-7
 Hotels-10
 Trailer parks-6
 Transportation-3 railroads; 13 truck
 lines
 Highways-U. S. 150 and 136- Interstate
 74- State Routes 1 and 10
 Airplanes- Airports- 1
 Airlines-1

¹¹Ibid, p. 6.

¹²Ibid, p. 6.

Hospitals-Lake View (217 beds, 40 basinettes)
 St. Elixabeth (190 beds, 22 basinettes)
 Vermilion County TB Hospital (60 beds)
 Veteran's Hospital (1,729 beds)
 Nursing homes-4 privately owned, Vermilion
 County Nursing Home
 Orphan's homes-1 (Vermilion County Children's
 Home)
 Police protection- 36 men and 7 cars
 Fire protection-51 men, 10 pieces of equip-
 ment, 4 stations
 Public library-1 with 104,000 volumes
 Lakes-1 (Lake Vermilion - source of the
 city's water supply)¹³

As has been indicated by the statistics presented, Danville is primarily a diversified industrial center, made up of approximately 40% industrial employees. This fact plays a definite part in the problem under analysis, as will be indicated further along in the paper.

The problem under analysis. In School District 118, the grading system in present use has frequently come under attack by both parents and teachers. The problem under analysis will be to determine the value of the present method of reporting to parents used in the Danville schools.

In attempting to evaluate the present grading system, five facets of the present method will be analyzed, in particular. These include the variability or uniformity of grading standards, the aims of the grading system, the first grade teachers' and parents' "try-out" of conferences, the "grading committee", and the 'new' report card.

¹³Ibid, p. 7.

To analyze the variability or uniformity of grading standards, the following procedure will be used. The average grades of students in grades one through six will be obtained from principals of three schools. These grades will be used to serve as a basis of comparison and study of school-to-school grade distribution and subject-to-subject grade distribution. A comparison of grades will be made in areas of most supervision with grades made in areas of least supervision. (An area of most supervision will refer to those areas in which the teacher notes progress with more precision, such as arithmetic. An area of least supervision will refer to those areas which do not require as much daily individual supervision, such as science, for example.) Grades made in "fixed" standard areas will be compared with grades made in other areas, as will grades made in self-contained classrooms with grades made in departmentalized classrooms.

The second facet of grading used in this system which will be analyzed is the aims of the present grading system. A questionnaire was sent to all elementary teachers in the system. It listed several hypothetical aims of the grading system. Teachers were asked to rank them in order of importance and add any other aims of the grading system which they felt should be included. Parents were also asked their opinions concerning the present aims of the grading system now in use.

To analyze the results of the first grade teachers' and parents' "try-out" of conferences, the questionnaire was again used to obtain information. Random samplings of first grade teachers and parents were asked specific questions concerning their feelings about the conferences.

An attempt was made to determine what has most recently been done about the present grading system by making a study of the "grading committee" to discover how it was initiated, how it functioned, what it recommended, and the implementations of the recommendations.

Finally, an attempt was made to determine the feelings of parents and teachers alike about the "new" report card, in particular, how they feel concerning the implementations of the "note" option and the communication results of the new card. The questionnaire method was again used. Random samplings of twenty-five parents from the seventeen elementary schools were asked their opinions on the matter. The entire elementary staff was given the opportunity to express themselves, as well, by completing the questionnaire sent them.

Examples of the questionnaires used in this study and tallied results to questions asked may be found in the Appendix at the end of the paper under the titles, Appendix Five, Appendix Six, and Appendix Seven.

CHAPTER II

AN EVALUATION OF THE GRADING SYSTEM

This case analysis on the present grading system in the Danville School System consists of five major parts. Each part will now be presented separately as an attempt is made to present the data gathered in order to trace the entire problem from inception to present status.

Variability or uniformity of grading standards.

In order to make this phase of the study, an attempt was made to secure copies of the average grades of students in grades one through six in the Danville schools for the year 1962-1963. It was discovered, however, that such information does not exist. Therefore, it was necessary to obtain registers from individual school principals and average the grades for each pupil. Three principals volunteered to allow use of their registers for this purpose. Consequently, the results obtained from this procedure must be considered as being only partially representative compared to what they might have been had it been possible to obtain the average grades of the entire elementary population for comparison purposes. The information obtained for this part of the study is included in tabular form as follows.

TABLE 5

AVERAGE GRADES OF FRANKLIN SCHOOL CHILDREN (1962-63)¹⁴

Grade	No. of Pupils	Reading					Language					Spelling					Arithmetic					Science					Social Studies														
		A	B	C	D	F	A	B	C	D	F	A	B	C	D	F	A	B	C	D	F	A	B	C	D	F	A	B	C	D	F										
6	28	4	3	1	3	7	1	1	7	1	2	7	1	1	2	7	4	3	1	0	9	1	1	5	3	2	5	1	0	9	2	4	7	1	2	3	2				
5	29	1	1	8	4	3	3	8	1	5	3	3	0	2	5	1	1	1	1	3	1	2	8	3	3	7	1	5	4	3	0	1	1	2	1	3	0				
4	33	5	7	1	5	5	1	5	7	1	4	3	4	1	6	1	0	1	6	4	1	0	9	7	3	2	7	1	4	5	5	1	9	1	8	4	1				
3	36	1	3	1	0	1	3	0	0	8	1	4	9	3	2	1	2	1	3	1	1	0	4	1	0	1	9	3	0	7	5	1	4	6	0	3	7	2	4	2	0
		E	S	U	F	E	S	U	F	E	S	U	F	E	S	U	F	E	S	U	F																				
2	41	1	0	2	8	1	2	4	3	4	2	1	7	2	4	7	3	2	2	3	8	8																			
1	43	5	4	1	3	1	4	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	3	0	2	4																						

TABLE 6

GRADES OF FRANKLIN SCHOOL CHILDREN ACCORDING TO NUMBER IN EACH SUBJECT AREA

Area	A's	B's	C's	D's	F's	E's	S's	U's	F's
Reading	33	28	45	15	5	15	62	2	5
Language	22	43	38	16	7	5	75	3	1
Spelling	65	31	16	6	8	7	24	7	3
Arithmetic	11	41	47	18	9	9	53	9	12
Science	18	27	42	23	7				
Social Studies	19	25	67	13	3				

¹⁴Obtained from the registers of Franklin School

TABLE 7

AVERAGE GRADES OF GARFIELD SCHOOL CHILDREN (1962-63)¹⁵

Grade	No. of Pupils	Reading					Language					Spelling					Arithmetic					Science					Soc. Stud.					
		A	B	C	D	F	A	B	C	D	F	A	B	C	D	F	A	B	C	D	F	A	B	C	D	F	A	B	C	D	F	
6 ¹	33	11	6	13	3	0	8	10	10	5	0	22	3	7	1	0	5	11	6	10	1	9	7	12	4	1	10	10	9	3	1	
6 ²	32	9	5	7	10	1	6	7	8	3	8	20	4	4	4	0	4	8	10	2	8	8	5	5	7	7	5	6	9	11	1	
5 ¹	34	14	3	15	2	0	12	4	11	7	0	21	4	8	1	0	10	7	8	7	2	12	4	9	9	1	6	9	13	5	1	
5 ²	33	7	13	6	7	0	6	12	12	2	1	20	9	3	1	0	7	13	7	2	4	9	8	7	5	4	6	12	9	5	1	
4 ¹	33	10	12	10	1	0	9	14	7	1	2	26	5	1	1	0	14	11	6	2	0	9	11	8	4	1	6	14	11	2	0	
4 ²	33	12	9	12	0	0	7	9	16	1	0	12	6	10	2	3	8	7	13	5	0	9	9	13	2	0	3	19	12	0	0	
3 ¹	31	9	9	10	3	0	5	10	9	7	0	12	10	2	3	4	11	10	4	3	3	6	13	10	2	0	4	14	13	2	0	
3 ²	32	19	7	5	1	0	10	12	8	2	0	17	9	3	3	0	8	12	10	1	1	18	6	7	1	0	12	10	9	0	1	
		E	S	U	F		E	S	U	F		E	S	U	F		E	S	U	F												
2 ¹	31	0	13	14	4		0	13	18	0		0	17	11	3		0	16	13	2												
2 ²	31	0	23	4	4		0	23	4	4		2	12	13	4		12	7	5	0												
1 ¹	33	5	19	8	1		0	33	0	0		0	0	0	0		4	22	1	6												
1 ²	38	6	28	1	3		1	24	2	1		0	0	0	0		1	19	4	4												

TABLE 8

GRADES OF GARFIELD SCHOOL CHILDREN ACCORDING TO NUMBER IN EACH SUBJECT AREA

Area	A's	B's	C's	D's	F's	E's	S's	U's	F's
Reading	91	64	78	27	1	11	83	27	12
Language	63	74	85	28	11	11	93	24	5
Spelling	150	50	36	16	7	2	29	24	7
Arithmetic	67	79	64	32	19	16	84	23	12
Science	80	64	70	32	16	0	0	0	0
Social Studies	52	94	82	28	5	0	0	0	0

¹⁵Obtained from the registers of Garfield School

TABLE 9
AVERAGE GRADES OF NORTHEAST SCHOOL CHILDREN (1962-63)¹⁶

Grade	No. of Pupils	Reading					Language					Spelling					Arithmetic					Science					Soc. Stud.				
		A	B	C	D	F	A	B	C	D	F	A	B	C	D	F	A	B	C	D	F	A	B	C	D	F	A	B	C	D	F
5 ¹	23	6	8	4	4	1	4	10	5	3	1	13	4	0	3	3	5	8	3	5	2	3	8	5	6	1	4	7	8	3	1
5 ²	26	5	8	11	1	1	3	11	7	5	0	16	6	0	1	3	3	9	6	7	1	2	12	5	5	2	5	12	4	4	1
5 ³	23	1	9	9	4	0	3	8	9	2	1	12	4	3	3	2	2	8	4	6	3	2	7	6	6	2	0	7	9	7	0
4 ¹	24	9	5	8	2	0	6	8	6	4	0	11	7	3	2	1	3	7	8	6	0	4	8	10	2	0	6	6	10	2	0
4 ²	25	7	8	7	1	2	6	7	8	3	1	12	5	4	2	2	5	8	6	5	1	4	9	4	8	0	7	6	9	2	1
3 ¹	23	3	2	9	9	0	2	8	4	5	4	5	8	4	2	2	7	3	6	4	3	2	2	9	6	4	1	4	5	9	4
3 ²	18	5	4	6	2	1	3	8	4	0	3	10	1	5	2	0	3	7	5	2	1	3	4	7	2	2	2	8	4	4	0
		E	S	U	F		E	S	U	F		E	S	U	F		E	S	U	F											
2 ¹	11	6	5	0	0		2	9	0	0		9	2	0	0		0	11	0	0											
2 ²	25	0	2	1	0	4	3	17	3	2		2	18	2	3		0	18	5	2											
1 ¹	27	0	2	0	5	2	0	2	1	4	2		9	13	3	2		1	19	5	2										
1 ²	27	0	1	7	9	1	2	23	1	1		3	22	1	1		2	20	5	0											

TABLE 10

GRADES OF NORTHEAST SCHOOL CHILDREN ACCORDING TO NUMBER IN EACH SUBJECT AREA

Area	A's	B's	C's	D's	F's	E's	S's	U's	F's
Reading	36	43	54	23	5	6	63	17	7
Language	27	60	43	22	10	7	71	8	5
Spelling	79	35	19	16	13	23	55	6	6
Arithmetic	28	50	38	35	11	3	68	15	4
Science	20	50	46	35	11	0	0	0	0
Social Studies	25	50	49	31	7	0	0	0	0

¹⁶Obtained from the registers of Northeast School

The following table compares the three schools.

TABLE 11
MEDIAN GRADES (GRADES 3 TO 6)

Area	Franklin	Garfield	Northeast
Reading	C	B	C
Language	B	B	B
Spelling	A	A	B
Arithmetic	C	B	C
Science	C	B	C
Social Studies	C	B	C

It is difficult to arrive at specific conclusions concerning the above data. However, one can see that grades in language and spelling are higher in all three schools than are grades in the other areas. The average grade in all other areas is C. The median grades at Garfield School are higher, on the whole, than those of the other two schools, which is as might be expected since Garfield School is located in a better part of the community and, on the whole, has children with higher ability who come from more stable environments. It would be unjustifiable to make further conclusions on the basis of available data. Much more must be taken into consideration, including such factors as socio-economic status and native intelligence.

The median grade in arithmetic, spelling, language, and reading in all three schools in grade two is S. This, too, is as might be expected since teachers are limited to E, S, U, and F in their choice of marks. The same holds true in grade one for all three schools with one exception. Northeast School gives grades in spelling in grade one while the other two schools do not. This, in itself, shows a lack of uniformity in grading in grade one. It should be restated that the data in this section of the paper are representative of only three of the seventeen elementary schools; therefore, results should be considered in light of this fact. The results might have been more conclusive had it been possible to obtain average grades for the entire elementary population.

To further compare the distribution of grades from school to school, the subject of reading was selected and further broken down into the percentage of each letter grade.

TABLE 12
PERCENTAGE OF EACH LETTER GRADE GIVEN IN READING

	Franklin	Garfield	Northeast
Per cent A's	15.7	24.1	13.04
Per cent B's	13.4	16.2	16.4
Per cent C's	21.4	19.0	20.06
Per cent D's	7.1	6.9	9.4
Per cent F's	2.3	.3	1.3

The data show, in nearly every case, that the percentages of each letter grade given in every school tends to be quite similar. Note, for example, the percentage of C's given at each of the three schools (21.4, 19.0, and 20.6). Likewise, the percentage of F's given show a marked resemblance. In fact, the only place where the percentages vary to a great extent is in the percentage of A's given at Garfield, which, in light of what has already been said concerning the caliber of students enrolled there, might be expected. Hence, it follows that on a percentage basis, very little discrepancy exists among the three schools in the area of reading.

Three parts are included in the study of subject-to-subject distribution. To compare an area of "most supervision" with an area of "least supervision," the subjects of reading ("most supervision") and science ("least supervision") were used. To compare a "fixed" standard area with another area, spelling ("fixed") and social studies were selected as examples. To compare grades made in a self-contained classroom with those made in a departmentalized classroom, one of the self-contained fifth grades at Garfield and a departmentalized fifth grade at Northeast were chosen.

The information which follows was obtained when an area of "most supervision" was compared with an area of "least supervision." Franklin's grades three to six were

used in this comparison.

TABLE 13

COMPARISON OF AN AREA OF "MOST SUPERVISION"
WITH AN AREA OF "LEAST SUPERVISION"

	"MOST SUPERVISION" (READING)	"LEAST SUPERVISION" (SCIENCE)
Per cent A's	26.2	15.3
Per cent B's	22.2	23.1
Per cent C's	35.7	35.9
Per cent D's	12.0	19.7
Per cent F's	3.9	6.0

There are ten per cent more A's and B's in the area of "most supervision," and likewise ten per cent fewer D's and F's in that area. This seems to support the idea that children are inclined to do better in an area in which more individual attention and close supervision are given. Fewer failures seem to result, as is shown in the comparison above.

Next was compared the "fixed" standard area of spelling with social studies. Below are the results.

TABLE 14

COMPARISON OF A FIXED STANDARD AREA
WITH SOCIAL STUDIES

	%A's	%B's	%C's	%D's	%F's
"Fixed" area	48.1	21.3	13.1	10.4	7.1
Social studies	13.7	30.6	31.0	19.7	5.0

In comparing these two areas, it was found that 69.4% of the grades given in the "fixed" standard area were above C as compared to 44.3% in social studies. The median spelling grade is a very high B while the median grade in social studies is C. The results might be indicative of the fact that teachers are told exactly how to grade spelling. The final grade given is dependent on grades made on the final test of the week, rather than on how well the child applies his spelling knowledge in other areas. Consequently, grades tend to be higher than they might otherwise be. It is reasonable to assume, of course, that grades in a "fixed" standard area will be higher than those in other areas, but when such a wide discrepancy as the one which is here indicated exists, there is an urgent need for a re-evaluation of the aims of the present method of grading and teaching spelling.

The third part of the study of subject-to-subject grade distribution included making the following comparison between a self-contained fifth grade classroom at Garfield and a departmentalized fifth grade classroom at Northeast. Results of such comparison appear in tabular form on the following page.

The figures indicate that very little correlation exists between the grades given in any subject in either room. If the only factor involved here is that one room is self-contained and the other is departmentalized, it

TABLE 15

COMPARISON BETWEEN A SELF-CONTAINED FIFTH GRADE
CLASSROOM AT GARFIELD AND A DEPARTMENTALIZED
FIFTH GRADE CLASSROOM AT NORTHEAST

	% of A's	% of B's	% of C's	% of D's	% of F's
Reading					
Garfield	41.2	8.8	44.1	5.9	0.0
Northeast	19.2	30.9	42.3	3.8	3.8
Language					
Garfield	35.3	11.8	32.4	20.6	0.0
Northeast	11.6	42.3	26.9	19.2	0.0
Spelling					
Garfield	61.8	11.8	23.5	2.9	0.0
Northeast	61.5	23.2	0.0	3.8	11.5
Arithmetic					
Garfield	29.4	20.6	23.5	20.6	5.9
Northeast	11.6	34.6	23.2	26.9	3.8
Science					
Garfield	35.3	14.8	23.5	23.5	2.9
Northeast	7.7	46.2	19.2	19.2	7.7
Social Studies					
Garfield	17.6	26.5	38.2	14.8	2.9
Northeast	19.2	15.4	46.2	15.4	3.8

would be safe to say that the children in the self-contained classroom made higher grades, on the whole, than the children in the departmentalized room because they are in a self-contained room. However, it cannot be asserted that the cause for the higher grades is a result of this factor, alone. In order to be more conclusive, one would need to make certain that such factors as IQ, socio-economic backgrounds, and the effect of the teacher or teachers involved, were constant, which, of course, is highly improbable.

Although there are few places where a correlation appears to exist between the grades given in one room and those given in the other, if one compares the percentages of grades given above C, a more marked similarity will be noted. For example, in reading there were 50% A's and B's given at Garfield as compared to 50.1% at Northeast. The same holds true for grades given below C; that is, there is a more marked similarity. The percentage of grades below C given in reading at Garfield is 5.9 as compared to 7.6 at Northeast. However, not enough facts are available to make a conclusion concerning the subject-to-subject distribution of grades in a self-contained classroom as compared to a departmentalized classroom.

The aims of the present grading system.--In order to obtain their opinions concerning the aims of the present grading system, teachers were asked in the questionnaire to rank what they consider the present aims to be in order of their importance. Teachers ranked these aims in the following order. The percentage in parentheses indicates what percentage the 154 who responded felt that aim to be of foremost importance.

1. To inform parents of the progress of children (46 teachers or 29.87%)
2. To inform children of their own progress (40 teachers or 25.95%)
3. To inform subsequent teachers of performance of children (35 teachers or 22%)
4. To inform administrators and supervisors of relative progress of children (33 teachers or 21.43%)

The results do not show any of the proposed aims to be considered of outstanding importance in comparison with the others. Therefore, it seems reasonably safe to assume that teachers feel all the aims listed are of importance. Consequently, they found it difficult to rank one as more important than another. It was expected that teachers would rank as most important the aim of informing parents of the progress of children. Thus it was surprising to note that it was ranked first by only 29.87% of the staff. Several teachers commented on this question. The concensus seemed to be that specific aims of the grading system do not exist, as such. Instead, each teacher develops his own set of aims which may, perhaps, be quite different from those of others. Teachers could add aims of their own which had not been listed. An aim frequently added was that of informing themselves of the progress of each individual in their room and of their class as a whole.

When asked if they felt teachers and parents alike are aware of the aims in the grading system, forty-three, or 27.92%, replied in the affirmative, while 111, or 72.08% replied in the negative. One hundred twenty-three, or 79.87%, of those responding feel there is a need for standardizing the aims and making them better known to parents and teachers, while thirty-one, or 20.13%, felt such standardization to be unnecessary. When asked if they were aware of the aims of the present

grading system used in the Danville schools, 307, or an overwhelming 93.59% of the 328 parents who answered the questionnaire said no. Only twenty-one, or 6.41%, answered affirmatively. Further comments will be made on this significant response in Chapter Three of this paper.

First grade teachers' and parents' "try-out" of conferences.--Prior to the fall of 1962, it was the policy in the Danville School System for first grade teachers to issue report cards all four grading periods. A new plan was inaugurated that fall and is still in use. At the first nine weeks of school, teachers are given as much time as is needed in their particular situation to hold twenty-minute conferences with each student's parents. Parents are sent notes telling them what time they are to arrive for their conference and what time it will end. During the conference period, the teacher informs the parent of the progress his child is making, suggests what the parent can do to help at home, and answers whatever questions the parent or parents may have. A questionnaire was sent to all first grade teachers and ten first-grade parents from each school to reply to questions concerning these conferences. The results showed that 76.98% of the teachers and 80.77% of the parents are in favor of holding such conferences at the end of the first nine weeks. However, when asked if they were in favor of holding conferences all four grading periods, only

27.78% of the teachers said "yes" will 34.12% of the parents answered affirmatively. Teachers who answered negatively gave as their reasons for not preferring conferences such responses as, "All parents won't come," "It's hard to keep on the topic," "Some parents stay too long," etc. Parents who answered negatively stated that they liked to have a written report of their child's progress or that the teacher didn't always get to the point when they had conferences. One parent said it was too hard for her to get a baby-sitter so she could get to the school for the conference. Again, comments will be made in Chapter Three on the outcome of the research on the conference try-out.

The "grading" committee.---In the fall of 1961, the administration recommended that a grading committee be formed to study the method of reporting being used at that time. The Elementary Supervisor was named by the Superintendent to head the committee. She then selected three principals and six teachers to serve with her on the committee. One teacher from each grade level was selected. The committee met monthly during the school year 1961-62. Grade cards from school systems throughout the nation were studied. Strong points of each were recorded. The grade card then being used was discussed, and its weak and strong points recorded. The committee made a list of recommendations and presented it to the Superintendent. However, because a

new superintendent was to be hired the following summer, the Elementary Director, who was the committee's chairman, suggested that no definite change be made in the report card being used until the committee knew the feelings of the new superintendent. Therefore, the only real change that occurred as a result of the committee's work was that the space for writing notes on the child's card was done away with and teachers were given the option of writing notes. When school resumed the next fall, the committee was disbanded and nothing else was done toward improving the present card. No copies of the recommendations the committee made are now available since there has been a complete turnover in administrative positions.¹⁷

Since 1961-62, there has been no grading committee in operation. However, as a result of a workshop held in January, 1964, a recommendation was made that one be formed and such recommendation was acted upon by the Director of Instruction, Mr. G. E. Cornwell. Such a committee has now been formed and will hold its first meeting in April, 1965. It will be headed by Mr. Walker, Principal of Washington School, and while it will be made up mainly of teachers, some parents may be asked to serve on it, as well.

How teachers and parents feel about the "new" report card.---When asked their opinion of the present method of reporting, only two teachers, or 1.3% of those responding, rated it as "very good," forty-one, or 26.62% as "good,"

¹⁷Interview with Myron Walker, Principal, Washington Grade School, February 6, 1964

eighty-five, or 55.19%, as "fair," twenty-one, or 13.64%, as "poor," and five, or 3.25%, declined to comment on the question. One-hundred twenty-six teachers, or 81.28% of those responding, said they write notes to some parents, while eighteen, or 11.69%, write to all parents, and nine, or 5.84%, write no notes. One teacher gave no reply to this question. Those who write notes do so mainly to parents of their weak students (77.92%). Only 3.25% write to parents of the average while 18.18% write to parents of all who need it and .65% write to parents of the superior.

Of the 328 parents who responded to the questionnaire, 133, or 40.55% said they receive notes from their child's teacher at the end of some grading period during the year. One-hundred ninety-five, or 59.45%, said they never receive a note. When asked if they would like to receive such a note, 79.27%, or 260 parents, said yes while sixty-eight, or 20.73%, said no. However, when asked if they actually understand what the grades of their child mean, an identical 79.27%, or 260 parents, replied affirmatively while sixty-eight, or 20.73%, replied negatively.

Since the new report card makes it unnecessary for the teacher to hold conferences, an attempt was made to determine the reaction to conferences of both teachers and parents. Teachers were asked if they would favor a policy of holding conferences at the end of the first nine weeks

rather than issuing cards. One-hundred twenty-three, or 77.27%, would favor such a policy while thirty-one, or 20.13%, would not. The majority of teachers felt such conferences should be between ten and thirty minutes in length. When asked if they were in favor of holding conferences all four grading periods if school time were allowed for it rather than issuing cards, eighty-seven, or 56.49%, said yes while sixty-seven, or 43.51%, said no. A combination of report card and conference was thought to be the most beneficial method of reporting in comparison to either a conference or report card. In favor of the combination were 127 teachers, or 82.47%. Twelve teachers, or 7.79%, favored the parent-teacher conference while fifteen, or 9.74%, favored the report card.

Parents were asked if they would prefer to have a conference with their child's teacher at the end of each grading period rather than receiving a card. The results showed that 128 parents, or 29.02% of those responding, would favor this suggestion while 200, or 60.98%, would not. When asked if such a conference should be required, 34.76% replied yes while 65.24% replied in the negative.

In Chapter III, comments will be made on what is felt to be the significant attitudes, opinions, etc., resulting from this study.

CHAPTER III

VALUE ANALYSIS OF THE PROBLEM

In order to make a value analysis of this problem, a thorough study of the evaluation of the grading system was made. From this study, found to be of particular significance were the decisions, apparent attitudes, actions, and occurrences listed below. Following the list, the apparent values operative in each significant instance will be indicated.

1. In the Danville School System, no study is made nor adequate records kept which would indicate the variability or uniformity of grading standards used within the system.
2. Both parents and teachers are concerned with the lack of uniformity in grading between the primary and intermediate grades and prefer more uniformity.
3. A lack of uniformity on what subjects should be given letter grades exists in grade one.
4. Areas of "most supervision" are given higher grades, as are "fixed" standard areas. Teachers disapprove of being told how to mark in "fixed" standard areas, and feel a need for re-evaluation along this line is in order.
5. Teachers feel that a definite uncertainty of the aims of our present grading system exists.

6. A definite need is apparent for standardizing such aims and making them better known to parents and teachers. Parents are definitely unaware of the aims.
7. First grade teachers and parents are definitely in favor of holding conferences at the end of the first nine weeks. About one-third of both parents and teachers favor holding them all four periods.
8. A well-organized grading committee needs to function at full force in an effort to discover and point out weaknesses of the present method of reporting.
9. Most teachers ranked the present method of reporting as fair rather than very good, good, or poor. This indicates a need for change.
10. The majority of teachers write notes to "some" parents, mainly to parents of their weaker students.
11. Most parents want to receive notes and cards as has always been the case in the past. About half of them say they do, at present, receive notes.
12. The majority of parents say they understand what letter grades mean.
13. Teachers would prefer to hold conferences at the end of the first nine weeks rather than issue cards.
14. Teachers are divided on the issue of holding conferences all four grading periods rather than issuing cards.
15. Teachers favor a combination of parent-teacher conference and report card as the best method of reporting to parents.

16. Parents would prefer to receive cards at the end of each grading period rather than having a parent-teacher conference.

In order to indicate the apparent values operative in each of these significant instances, Mort's common sense principles were used as a guide. In Dewey's *THE THEORY OF LOGIC*, he states:

It is commonplace that every cultural group possesses a set of meanings which are deeply imbedded in its customs, occupations, traditions and ways of interpreting its physical environment and group-life, that they form the basic categories of the language-system by which details are interpreted. Hence they are regulative and "normative" of specific beliefs and judgments.¹⁸

The principles to be used here represent a breakdown of the phenomena to which Dewey refers.

One of Mort's common sense principles is the basic principle of democracy which states that "each human being be dealt with by his fellows as a living, growing, potentially flowering organism and has a right to be a participant in decisions that stand to affect him."¹⁹ This principle is in operation in the apparent attitude of concern which both parents and teachers express over the lack of uniformity of grading between the primary and intermediate grades. Both parents and teachers think a change is needed and should have the right to participate in such a decision as one concerning change. It is

¹⁸ Paul Mort, Principles of School Administration (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1946), p. 96.

¹⁹ Ibid, p. 112.

also in operation in both parents' and teachers' attitudes toward a need for more standardized aims. A well-organized grading committee, if set up, would need to be allowed to put the principle of democracy into action because democratic participation involves the right to influence decisions.

The political democracy principle requires that the exercise of control over policy or action be placed as close to the people as can be done feasibly, all other principles taken into account.²⁰ Therefore, if parents were sent notes as they so desire, the political democracy principle would be in effect, just as it would if the teachers' wish to hold conferences at the end of the first nine weeks rather than send cards was adhered to. Likewise, the same would be true if it were decided to hold conferences all four grading periods in preference to issuing cards, as suggested by about one-third of both parents and teachers.

Teachers feel that the principle of justice, which demands the protection of the individual from rigidity of systems of procedure, etc., on the one hand, and from arbitrariness in the exercise of administrative discretion on the other, is not being applied when they are made to adhere to strict methods of procedure in grading "fixed" standard areas as compared to other areas.²¹

²⁰Ibid, p. 138.

²¹Ibid, p. 34.

Application of the justice principle might improve this situation.

Prudence implies the ability to regulate; to calculate; to employ skill and sagacity in the management of practical affairs; to exercise caution and circumspection; to use foresight, that is, give due regard to the future, to apply forethought, that is, give due consideration to contingencies--in substance, the capacity to exercise wisdom as the outgrowth of experience.²² It is felt that prudence should be used by those in the system who should be responsible for keeping adequate records or making necessary studies to determine the variability and uniformity of grading standards within the system. This would involve having the capacity to exercise wisdom in future planning as the outgrowth of experience and knowledge gained from such a study.

Simplicity is a value which is apparent in several of the attitudes which were judged to be significant. For example, it was found that parents in the system still prefer to receive cards rather than to have conferences at the end of each grading period. Parents are suspicious of procedures that are so complicated that they cannot readily understand them. They prefer not to consider strange sounding objectives and strange procedures. For such a change in

²²Ibid, p. 174.

procedure to result, an understanding of the basic characteristics of the school needs to be built. Teachers feel that parent-teacher conferences are an excellent means of reporting, but they, too, still wish to cling to the old, familiar tried and tested combination of cards and conferences. Again, the value of simplicity is apparent. When parents were asked if they understood what letter grades mean, eighty per cent replied affirmatively, indicating their desire to keep the simple, familiar method of reporting in force.

There are signs of adaptability, or the ability to adjust to newly developing needs or to new insights into methods of meeting old needs, apparent among parents and teachers, however.²³ Most teachers, for example, rated the present method of grading as fair, indicating that they realize a need to incorporate new methods of grading in order to meet old needs. A large number of teachers, although not a majority, indicated they would be in favor of holding conferences all four grading periods, indicating, again, that many are aware of a need for reform in present methods. Parents, too, show signs of adaptability, especially first grade parents who have been exposed to conferences and show a definite interest in them.

²³Ibid, p. 177.

Parents and teachers both recognize a need for stability in the present method of grading.²⁴ It was found that a lack of uniformity existed about what subjects should be given letter grades in first grade. In one school, the students were graded in spelling while in two other schools, no spelling grade was given. This lack of uniformity could be confusing and bewildering to a transfer student, his parents, and his new teacher. A certain amount of stability is believed to be a necessary thing. Teachers also indicated that the aims of the present grading system should be more stable and uniform. This does not mean they should be fixed and rigid, but should be clearly understood by both parents and teachers.

In this study, the principal characters involved were the administrators, the teachers, and the parents or community members. An attempt will now be made to construct the theoretical commitments of the principal characters and to identify the roles of these individuals.

To function well in his capacity, the administrator, in this case, should be just, prudent, adaptable, and democratic. It would be his duty to see that steps are taken to organize a grading committee which, in effect, would be responsible for determining and pointing out weaknesses of the grading system and presenting ideas and programs of improvement for consideration. It would be his duty to see that steps are taken to standardize

²⁴ Ibid, p. 227.

the aims of the present grading system. He would also be responsible, indirectly, for helping to rid parents of suspicions of procedures that might be cause for improvement of the grading system. This is not to say that he should be responsible for the task of discovering a practical way to meet the needs for change which are apparent in the grading system, but rather that he be responsible for seeing that teachers and parents are made aware of that need and thus should, themselves, be willing to work toward filling that need.

The teachers can do more for improving the present method of reporting. First they must set up a value-system by which they can proceed. They should be willing to employ the principles of democracy, should be just, should provide for equality of opportunity, should exercise prudence, should employ simplicity in a sensible manner, and should be adaptable, flexible, and stable as they attempt to find means to improve the situation. They should realize that they will need to do creative thinking rather than merely the critical thinking of an analyst.

The committee on grading which has recently been set up by the administration is composed largely of teachers. Thus a good start has been made. If the members of the committee will employ the common sense principles heretofore mentioned, and will determine the weaknesses of the present method of grading and set about to evolve a better method, improvement may be forthcoming. The

committee members should involve the entire teaching staff in the formulation of new methods, although enlightening of staff members concerning other available methods may be necessary.

Parents are also principal characters in this study. An attempt was made to determine and discover their feelings concerning the present method of grading being used, and it is felt that their views and opinions should be given much consideration by the grading committee. The administrative staff has already expressed interest in the findings concerning both parents' and teachers' views; thus it is likely that such views will be given consideration. It is difficult to ascertain the theoretical commitments of the parents and to define the roles they play in the problem. However, if the common sense principles are put into action, parents should definitely have a role in attempting to formulate new methods or solutions to the problem. It might be well to include parents on the grading committee. Such parents may be willing to attend PTA meetings, etc., and thus carry home to the other parents by means of speeches and the like why a need for improvement and re-evaluation of the present method is necessary and how parents would benefit from a change in method.

As the situation now stands, no one group is largely responsible for the present method being used, but, instead, such method has merely been employed

without much question or concern and the situation is at a standstill, so to speak. A prognosis follows in the next section.

CHAPTER FOUR

RECOMMENDATIONS

As a result of this study, it has been found that the present system of grading now being used by the Danville Schools is not felt by either parents or teachers to be as effective as it should be. Further research in this area would prove to be even more helpful.

If the present system of grading is allowed to continue, parents and teachers will continue to be unsatisfied with the results. Reports should be designed so as to inform parents and establish good home-school relationships, and it is evident that the present method of reporting is not achieving such aims. In fact, most parents and teachers are unaware of the aims of the grading system.

On the other hand, something can be done about the present method of reporting to parents, if, as a result of the interest stirred in teachers and administrators in response to the questionnaire used in this study, positive steps are taken to improve the situation. The Director of Instruction, Mr. Cornwell, has expressed a desire to study the results of all questionnaires used,

as have several administrators. Copies of the results will be sent to principals, administrators, and members of the newly-formed grading committee.

Because the Danville School System is at present in serious financial difficulty, it is not likely that any change which would put a strain on present funds will be given very serious consideration. However, attempts can and must still be made to discover weaknesses in the present system of reporting so that when, and if, funds become available for such purposes, improvement may more likely be forthcoming.

This particular topic was chosen for study because of interest in the present trends and practices in reporting to parents. Before a defensible outcome was determined, several authorities on the subject were referred to and their thoughts and ideas studied and considered.

Kindred states that parents should be involved in planning the method of reporting. He even suggests that children be included in helping the teacher establish the grade to be given. He tells of schools in which teachers invite the parents to help them establish the grade or record to be given. In some communities, parents and teachers together work out reports to parents after a series of studies and evaluations have been made.²⁵

²⁵Leslie Kindred, How to Tell the School Story (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1957), pp. 135-136.

Kindred warns that parents should instigate and enjoy such activities as working out a check sheet or report on how they should work with the child at home, and should not have such activities thrust on them by the school. He feels that parents' comments to the teacher can be equally successful in establishing good will if the parent has acted with appreciation and understanding.

Many educators emphasize the fact that too much importance is attached to marks, as do Benjamin and Lillian Fine. They feel more emphasis should be put on whether or not the child is getting anything out of the course rather than on his mark. They suggest that marks, symbols, letters, checks, etc., should be abolished.

Overemphasis on marks, they feel, may confuse a child and cause him to think that a collection of A's is the primary reward for studying. They point out the fact that report cards can only be thought of as rough measures of achievement, since teachers mark differently. They realize, of course, that marks could be abolished only under more or less ideal conditions such as better qualified teachers, smaller classrooms with a maximum of fifteen students, parent-teacher conferences to discuss a child's ability, and recognition by colleges that grades are a worthless method of judging students.²⁶

²⁶ Benjamin and Lillian Fine, How to Get the Best Education for Your Child (New York: G. C. Putnam, 1959), pp. 198-200.

Jameson attempts to show parents why the present methods of reporting now being used are not carrying the message they should. He tells of various reactions which parents experience as a result of receiving report cards, and attempts to explain why he feels teachers can not be blamed as is so often the case. He suggests parent-teacher conferences as a more valuable method of reporting and explains why.²⁷

Two other educators who write that they are in favor of parent-teacher conferences are Earl H. Hanson, Superintendent of Schools in Rock Island at the time his article was written, and Dr. Hans Olsen, Consultant for General Education with the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction in Illinois. Hanson feels that no report card, no matter how good, can do the job of reporting alone. It should be accompanied by long, extended and intimate contact between teacher and parent, both of whom clearly understand the obligation to develop in each child "success in competition" and the "fulfillment of self."²⁸ He believes that routine scheduled parent-teacher conferences should occur in every elementary school, and suggests at least two be held, one in the fall after the teacher and child have come to know each other, and one in the spring when what the child is doing can be discussed. Olsen is

²⁷ Marshall Jameson, Helping Your Child Succeed in School (New York: G. C. Putnam's Sons, 1962), p. 89.

²⁸ Earl Hanson, What is Success and How Should We Report to Parents (New York: Bobbs-Merrill, 1961), p. 126.

in agreement with Hanson that parent-teacher conferences do the most adequate job of reporting to parents. He, too, feels reporting should be personal and direct, and should allow for two-way conversation between parent and teacher.

In another book, Fine suggests and explains several other ways of reporting to parents besides sending report cards home. These include conferences with parents, letters to parents, progress reports, and compromise reports. Again he asserts that more emphasis should be placed on what the child is actually learning rather than on marks.²⁹

The intention here is not to suggest that all educators are in favor of changing the methods of reporting presently being used today because such is not the case. Rudd severely criticizes what he calls the "progressivists' method of reporting" which demands more parent-teacher conferences, advocates lesser emphasis on marks, and puts more emphasis on what is being learned rather than on marks.³⁰

In summary, the following value statements were developed for use as guides:

1. The main purpose of a reporting system is to carry a message to parents.
2. It should summarize the child's progress and success in his academic achievement.

²⁹Benjamin Fine, The Modern Family Guide to Education (New York: Doubleday and Company, 1962), p. 47.

³⁰Augustin Rudd, Bending the Twig (New York: American Book, Stratford-Press, Inc., 1957), p. 82.

3. It should give information about his progress or lack of progress in the areas of social behavior, health, and citizenship.
4. It should be accurate and present information in a manner easily understood.
5. It should require a minimum amount of clerical work.
6. Parents should be educated to understand the report. That is, it should be explained to them so they will understand it.
7. It should include adjustment to life as well as to academic subjects in school.
8. It should set up a standard of value of work for its own sake rather than for marks.
9. It should be suitable for the age level for which it is made.
10. It should consider the child as an individual as well as a member of a group.

In order for improvement to be made in the Danville School's method of reporting, a further analysis of the present feelings of parents, teachers, and pupils, should be made. It has been observed that many parents and teachers in the system are not satisfied with the present method of reporting. Now further attempts should be made to discover why. Such questions as the following should be asked. How many parents are really in favor of the present system? Who really like it? How many feel it is alright as it is? How many have no feelings about it one way or the other?

Other methods of reporting need to be given serious consideration. Parents, as well as teachers, should be given a voice in developing a better system. They should be included on the grading committee so that their opinions may be heard and considered.

It is suggested that parent-teacher conferences be initiated in all grades on a trial basis, at least. Two conferences should be held, one in fall and one in spring. Report cards may be issued at the end of the other two periods. However, the present report card should be replaced by one which more closely meets the requirements given in the preceding value system. Parents should be encouraged to ask for conferences at the end of the second and third period, as well, if they feel such conferences to be beneficial to them. Teachers should be taught how to hold meaningful conferences. In years to come, the report card should be eliminated entirely if conferences prove to be successful. These recommendations have been made on the basis of the following characteristics of the parent-teacher conferences as a reporting scheme:

1. Reporting can be direct and personal.
2. Much more can be said by the teacher than can be written.
3. Parents can ask questions directly if they do not understand.
4. The parent can give the teacher invaluable, directive information about home life.

5. The child's work is at hand, and can be discussed and explained.
6. Teachers and parents become better acquainted with one another.
7. Parents and teachers together can develop plans for helping the child.
8. Parents are more likely to learn more about the educational program, and thus may become more interested in promoting programs for better schools.
9. Behavioral problems can be better talked over.
10. Competitive aspects of the child's school life can be largely eliminated.
11. From such interpersonal relations, both parents and teachers may benefit from constructive advice.

It is felt that, as a result of doing this problem study, a small beginning has been made in improving the present system of reporting and that more improvement is likely to result in time.

APPENDIXES

SCHOOL														3-2-64	3-1-63	9-11-63	
	GR. 1	GR. 2	GR. 3	GR. 4	GR. 5	GR. 6	GR. 7	GR. 8	GR. 9	GR. 10	GR. 11	GR. 12	GR. 13	GR. 14	TOTAL	TOTAL	TOTAL
CANNON	60	51	53	62	59	58									343	355	353
COLLETT	72	59	54	45	63	37									330	293	323
DANIEL	82	82	65	56	62	70									417	342	420
DOUGLAS	48	52	56	54	44	39									293	299	291
EDISON	69	75	77	87	89	77									474	360	470
ELMWOOD	57	70	50	68	55	40									340	324	361
FAIRCHILD	76	67	60	60	51	52									376	312	386
FRANKLIN	38	32	37	26	34	28									195	185	191
GARFIELD	68	72	63	62	70	78									413	361	407
GRANT	32	27	21	20	31	22									153	146	149
HOOTON																	90
JACKSON																	179
LIBERTY																	82
LINCOLN	56	43	42	47	41	43									272	237	244
MCKINLEY	35	23	27	34	19	25									163	137	160
NORTHEAST	85	70	72	84	58	76									445	479	440
OAKLAWN	45	42	36	41	47	43									254	256	258
ROSELAWN	56	66	57	83	76	60									408	414	397
TILTON	36	30	29	34	38	28									195	201	208
WASHINGTON	88	70	52	56	62	65									393	356	391
TOTAL Gr. 1-6	1013	931	851	919	909	841									5464	5408	5449
NORTH RIDGE JHS							266	268	282						816	850	830
EAST PARK JHS							305	257	265						827	814	832
SOUTH VIEW JHS							249	267	247						763	802	752
TOTAL Gr. 7-9							820	792	794						2406	2466	2414
DANVILLE SHS										772	689	461			1922	1678	2012
DANVILLE JR. COLLEGE													335	167	502	514	474
SPECIAL EDUCATION																	
MULTIPLY HAND. *			1	1	1		2	1							5*	6*	5*
VISUAL HAND. *			3	1		1									5*	0	5*
EMH	113														113	101	97
DEAF	6														6	6	5
HOMEBOUND (Elem.)	1	2		1		1	(1 ungraded)								6	4	4
HOMEBOUND (JHS)							2								2	3	1
HOMEBOUND (SHS)															0	2	0
PHYS. HAND.			1		1	4	1	1							8	10	8
TRAINABLE	10														10	10	9
TOTAL SPEC. EDUC.															155	142	134
GRAND TOTAL															10,439	10,202	10,473

* Counted in classroom

APPENDIX II

PERSONNEL IN DISTRICT 118 SCHOOLS

Danville Junior College	1	Dean	13	teachers
Danville Senior High	1	Principal	78	teachers
East Park Junior High	1	"	40	"
North Ridge Junior High	1	"	39	"
South View Junior High	1	"	37	"
Cannon & Elmwood Schools	1	"		
Cannon			12	teachers
Elmwood			12	"
Collet School	1	"	11	"
Daniel School	1	"	14	"
Douglas & Northeast Schools	1	"		
Douglas			10	" + 2 EMH
Northeast			16	"
Edison School	1	"	13	"
Fairchild and Lincoln Schools	1	"		
Fairchild			12	"
Lincoln			10	"
Franklin & Garfield	1	"		
Franklin			6	"
Garfield			12	"
Grant & Tilton	1	"		
Grant			5	"
Tilton			7	"
McKinley and Washington	1	"		
McKinley			6	"
Washington			13	"
			4	E.M.H.

Accredited by the Office of the State Department of Public Instruction at all levels and by the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools at the senior high level.

APPENDIX II (cont.)

Elementary schools feeding into each junior high school are:

<u>East Park J. H. S.</u>	<u>North Ridge J. H. S.</u>	<u>South View J.H.S.</u>
Oaklawn	Edison	Douglas
Elmwood	Roselawn	Washington
Cannon	Franklin	McKinley
Northeast	Garfield	Tilton
Fairchild	Lincoln	Grant
Collett		Daniel

Boundaries:

The Curriculum Department Committee recommends to the Superintendent who either approves or revises or recommends to the Board of Education for final approval.

The committee is composed of people from the Central Office and principals.

APPENDIX III

SUPERVISORS AND CONSULTANTS IN THE DANVILLE PUBLIC SCHOOLS
1963-1964

Elementary Curriculum Supervisor

Elementary Music Consultant

Technical & Vocational Education Director

Physical Education, Health & Athletic Supervisor

Music Supervisor

Foreign Language Supervisor

Pupil Personnel Supervisor

Audio-visual & Library Supervisor

Language Arts Elementary Consultant

Director of Instruction

GUIDANCE AND SPECIAL EDUCATION

Danville High School

1 Guidance Director
3 Guidance Counselors

1 Special Education Director

2 Social Workers

5 Speech Correctionists

1 Partially Sighted teacher

1 Multiply Handicapped teacher

1 Trainable Mentally Handicapped teacher

6 Educable Mentally Handicapped - 4 at Washington School
2 at Douglas School

1 Physically Handicapped teacher

APPENDIX IV

BOARD OF EDUCATION

COMMUNITY CONSOLIDATED SCHOOL DISTRICT # 118

	First year elected	Profession or Occupation	Level of Education	
			H.S.	College
1.	1961	Attorney		x
2.	1956	Attorney		x
3.	1962	Homebuilder Engineer		x
4.	1958	Chiropractor		x
5.	1963	Manager of Sanitary District		x
6.	1963	Maintenance Su- pervisor for chain of super markets	x	
7.	1959	Accountant for General Contractor		x

Obtained from Mr. Guy Cornwell, Director of Instruction

APPENDIX V

QUESTIONNAIRE SENT TO 180 TEACHERS
(154 responses received)

Dear Teachers:

I would appreciate your co-operation in completing the following questionnaire in order that the results may be used in a research paper about grading in the Danville School System. Thank you very much.

Gary Rogers
Franklin School

1. What grade do you teach? _____
2. Following are some hypothetical but realistic aims of our grading system. Please rank them 1, 2, 3 or 4 in order of importance. If you feel one to be equally as important as another, give them the same rank. Feel free to comment or add any other aims of our grading system which you feel should be listed.

_____inform parents of the progress of children

_____inform subsequent teachers of performance of children

_____inform administrators and supervisors of relative progress of children

_____inform children of their own progress
3. Do you feel teachers and parents alike are aware of our aims in the grading system? _____
4. Do you feel there is a need for standardizing the aims and making them better known by parents and teachers? _____
5. Is it the policy in your grade to hold conferences at the end of the first nine weeks rather than issue report cards? _____
6. If such is not the case, would you favor such a policy if time were allowed for it? _____
7. What is the average amount of time you feel should be spent in such a conference? _____
8. If time were allowed for it, would you be in favor of holding conferences all four grading periods rather

APPENDIX VI

QUESTIONNAIRE SENT TO 425 PARENTS
(328 responses received)

Dear Parents:

Your co-operation in completing the following questionnaire will be appreciated. The results are to be used in a research paper about grading in the Danville School System. Please return it to school with your child within a day after receiving it. Thank you.

Gary Rogers
Franklin School Teacher

1. How many children do you have in grades one through six? _____
2. In what grade or grades are they enrolled? _____
3. Since the report card gives the teacher the option of writing notes to parents, do you receive a note from your child's teacher at the end of the grading period? _____
4. Would you like to receive a note explaining the grades your child receives? _____
5. When your child receives a letter grade each grading period, do you actually know what the grade means?

6. Are you aware of the aims of our present grading system? _____
7. Would you prefer to have a conference with your child's teacher at the end of each grading period so the teacher could be more specific in her report of your child's progress rather than receiving a report card with letter grades on it? _____
8. Should this conference be required? _____
9. Should parents be given the privilege of having a conference if they so desire it? _____

APPENDIX VII

QUESTIONNAIRE SENT TO 170 FIRST GRADE PARENTS
(126 responses received)

Dear First Grade Parents:

In a course I am taking as a candidate for a Master's Degree, I am making a study of the present grading system being used in Danville. I need your comments and feelings about the conference which your child's teacher held with you the first nine weeks. Will you please answer the following questions and return this questionnaire to school. I will appreciate your co-operation. Thank you very much.

Gary Rogers
Franklin School Teacher

1. Are you in favor of holding a conference with your child's teacher at the end of the first nine weeks in grades one rather than receiving a report card?

2. Do you feel a conference is more helpful to you than a card would be at that time? _____
3. Would you be in favor of holding conferences all four grading periods rather than issuing cards?

4. If not, why not?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Fine, Benjamin and Lillian. How to Get the Best Education for Your Child. New York: G. C. Putnam's Sons, 1959.
- Fine, Benjamin. The Modern Guide to Education. New York: Doubleday and Company, 1962.
- Hymes, James L. Effective Home-School Relations. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1953.
- Jameson, Dr. Marshall. Helping Your Child Succeed in School. New York: G. C. Putnam's Sons, 1962.
- Kindred, Leslie. How to Tell the School Story. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1957.
- League of Women Voters. Danville Digest of Local Government. Danville: League of Women Voters, 1963.
- Morse, Arthur. Schools of Tomorrow--Today. New York: Doubleday and Company, 1960.
- Mort, Paul R. Principles of School Administration. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1946.
- Rudd, Augustin. Bending the Twig. New York: American Book, Stratford-Press, Inc., 1957.
- Turbian, Kate. A Manual for Writers of Term Papers, Theses, and Dissertations. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1955.

Magazine Articles

- Olsen, Hans. "Reporting to Parents," Illinois Education Association Journal, (January, 1964), 199-201.

Pamphlets

- Danville, Illinois. Danville: Chamber of Commerce, 1963.