

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 094 854

PS 007 260

TITLE Early Admission to Kindergarten: Practices of Minnesota School Districts, 1972-73; Issues to Consider; Questions to Ask.

INSTITUTION Minnesota State Dept. of Education, St. Paul. Elementary and Secondary Section.

PUB DATE Oct 73

NOTE 43p.

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.75 HC-\$1.85 PLUS POSTAGE

DESCRIPTORS Academic Ability; *Admission Criteria; Age Grade Placement; Disadvantaged Youth; *Early Admission; *Evaluation Methods; Gifted; Interviews; *Kindergarten; Parent Attitudes; Readiness; *School Policy; School Surveys; Social Maturity; Student Behavior

ABSTRACT

This report is an effort to provide information on school district practices during the 1972-73 school year on early admission of children to kindergarten. The responses of 115 school districts in Minnesota provided information on early admission practices and reported some of the issues involved. Procedures discussed in selection of children are initiation of parent interest, fees, pretesting interviews, posttesting interviews, and followup to a child's placement. Selection criteria were birthdate cutoff, physical maturity, emotional and social maturity, academic skills, appropriate pupil behaviors, preschool experiences, and mental age. Six issues which need further consideration are also discussed: previous studies in early admission, necessary research design, age as a criterion, children for whom early admission should be considered, the effect of the school program on early admissions, and issues concerning readiness. The appendix lists each school district and its type of early admission policy. (SDH)

ED 094854

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

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

EARLY ADMISSION TO KINDERGARTEN

Practices of Minnesota School Districts 1972-73

Issues to Consider

Questions to Ask

PS 007260

**Elementary and Secondary Section
Minnesota State Department of Education**

October 1973

Preface

In our culture up until the last decade the education of children to the ages of five or six has been the responsibility of the home, largely the responsibility of mothers. While children of more affluent parents sometimes had nursery school experiences, most children of middle and low income families had few opportunities to participate in educational programs until the advent of Head Start in 1965. The federal government statistics show that 25.5% of children 3 to 5 were enrolled in preprimary programs in 1964; the latest figures reported in 1972 show that now 41.6% of children 3 to 5 are in preprimary programs.

In Minnesota the number of school districts offering kindergarten programs also increased in the decade from 1962-72. In 1962 there were 174 districts that offered kindergarten as compared with 412 districts offering kindergarten in 1972. As the law has been changed to require school districts to provide kindergarten in 1974, we will soon be providing all children in our state the opportunity of entering school at age 5.

For children born between September and January there is a time lag between their becoming five and their opportunity to enter school. Each Minnesota school district can allow selected children who are underage to enter school before they are five. State direction in helping school districts to make decisions on the selection of children was last provided in 1962.

This report is an effort to provide information on school district practices during the 1972-73 school year on early admission of children to kindergarten. It is also an attempt to take a first look at some of the issues that are involved in early admissions. These are presented as preliminary suggestions to school districts. More discussion and further investigation are needed to reach decisions that will improve present practices and bring the decision-making on selection of children closer to those who work with children.

Corinna Moncada, Ph.D.
Early Childhood Education Consultant

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Present Practices of Minnesota School Districts	2
Procedures for Selection	2
Criteria Used to Select Children	4
Issues to Consider	6
What Studies Have Been Done on Early Admission?	6
What Research Design is Needed?	6
Age as a Criterion of School Entrance	6
For Whom Should Early Admission be Considered?	7
How Does the School Program Affect Early Admission?	9
What are Some of the Issues Surrounding Readiness?	10
Questions to Ask	11
Perspectives of Parents	11
Perspectives of Teachers	11
Perspectives of Administrators	11
Perspectives of Psychologists	12
References and Resources	13
Appendix	
Tabulation of 1972-73 Reports on Existing Policies	15

EARLY ADMISSION TO KINDERGARTEN

In October 1962 a committee formed through the State Department of Education and consisting of members from metropolitan school districts developed some criteria for early admissions programs. No follow-up was done to determine how school districts were developing policies on early admissions.

In 1967 the legislature amended M.S. 1965 120.06 and 123.35, subd. 9. The legislature gave school districts a four-year adjustment time to meet the requirement of a uniform entrance date to kindergarten. The legislation provided that all children selected under an early admissions policy established by the school board would be admitted.

In 1972 the State Department of Education asked school districts whether they had an early admission policy for kindergarten children. There were responses from all school districts and 136 districts indicated that they did have an early admissions policy. When districts were asked for a copy of their policy, 115 school districts responded with varying amounts of detail about what they were doing locally to implement a policy. Some districts gave both the policy they had adopted and the procedures they had used to implement that policy; others did not. A tabulation of the existing policies of the 115 school districts presents some interesting contrasts and commonalities.

A breakdown of responses into three major categories revealed that 73 districts appear to rely primarily on the evaluation of a psychologist and individualized tests given by the psychologist. There were 28 districts that made use of a preliminary interview by school personnel before referring a child to a psychologist; a few districts allowed school personnel to make a decision about whether further testing was warranted. Fourteen school districts appear to be following some of the recommendations for early admissions that were distributed by the State Department of Education in 1962 as a result of action by a metropolitan-area committee. The districts following the guidelines were likely to make use of form letters to explain the policy to parents, criteria to be used in evaluating the children, and a procedure for interviewing parents and children. Although the recommendations had emphasized evaluation of the child's progress if admitted to school, few districts retained this aspect of the early admissions suggestions.

Present Practices of Minnesota School Districts

In May of 1962 there were 43 districts with early admission policies. Ten years later in 1972, there were 126 school districts reporting early entry policies; these represented 31% of the school districts in the state.

Procedures for Selection

Initiation of interest. Early admission to school was initiated by parent interest and concern in 106 school districts reporting policies. Only four did not wait for parents to ask about early entry to school. In one district all children were screened in May, another district announced the early admission policy through the news media, newspapers in another district notified parents when the district planned to have group testing of children who would be eligible for early admission, and the fourth district notified all parents with children in the age bracket to be eligible for early entry. There were 6 districts that did not indicate how the first home-school contact was made.

Fee. Since most districts made use of psychological testing of children, the fee for this evaluation was either a parent or a school district responsibility. There was a tendency for districts to consider this a parent responsibility. The following procedures were reported by districts:

<u>No. of Districts</u>	<u>Procedure</u>
74	Parents paid the entire cost
18	District did not state how fee was paid
12	District paid for evaluation
3	Costs were shared by parents and district
3	District paid if child was admitted; parents paid if child was not accepted
2	Parents were required to pay for testing if they used a nondistrict psychologist; district paid for use of psychologist they chose
2	Parents paid for testing if they requested it; district paid if they recommended further testing
1	Parents paid if the child was born later than September; district paid for children with September birthdates
6	Districts made provisions for waiving the testing fee for hardship cases

Pretesting interview. Forty-four districts reported using an interview with parents or with parents and the child before referring a child for psychological testing. Some districts allowed school personnel to make a decision on whether further testing was warranted. In most districts this decision denied children admittance. In a few districts the decision replaced formal testing. The following is a tabulation of the participants at the pretesting interview:

<u>No. of Districts</u>	<u>Interview Participants</u>
13	parent/child/principal
6	parent/principal
5	parent/child/principal/kindergarten teacher
4	screening of groups of children
2	parent/principal or superintendent
2	parent/elementary coordinator
1	parent/child/elementary director
2	parents/school
2	parent/child/psychologist
1	parent/child/psychologist or reading specialist
1	parent/board of education
1	parent/child/elementary counselor
1	parent/counselor
2	parent/child/school
1	parent/child/visiting teacher

Post-testing interview. Only 12 districts report conferences after the child has been tested. The participants at these conferences vary:

<u>No. of Districts</u>	<u>Participants</u>
1	parent/principal/superintendent
1	parent/principal
1	parents/school
2	conference
1	parent/superintendent
2	parents/psychologist
1	parent/child/principal/superintendent/teacher
1	parent/child/principal/elementary director/teacher
1	parent/child/school board
1	parents/pupil personnel coordinator

Written communication with parents was reported by 11 districts.

Follow-up to child's placement. Eleven districts make placement of a child in kindergarten on a trial basis. Three districts evaluate at a determined time: six weeks, two months, the first reporting period. Other districts did not detail when trial placement was evaluated. No district gave criteria to evaluate adequate adjustment to kindergarten.

Criteria Used to Select Children

Birthdate cutoff. Most districts did not report an age criteria for selection of children; 70 districts made no mention of the child's age. Five school districts admitted only children with September birthdays. Ten districts considered children whose birthdays fell between September 1 and October 31. Two districts accepted children with birthdates before November 15. Ten districts had September through November as acceptable birthdates for early admission. Eighteen school districts considered children whose birthdays fell in the three-month period from September through December.

Physical maturity. In 51 school districts the physical development of the child was considered in selecting children for early admission. An examination by a physician and a recommendation from the doctor was required in 11 school districts.

Emotional and social maturity. For 52 school districts the social and emotional development was considered. Aside from the use of the Vineland Social Maturity Scale mentioned by just 7 districts, the assessment appears to be informal.

Academic skills. Twenty-four districts mentioned some type of academic readiness as the basis for selection of children; language development was mentioned by 15, reading was considered by 8, and mathematics was indicated by 1 district. Districts used measures such as the Metropolitan Reading Readiness Test (3), Gates, ABE Inventory and Brueckner Arithmetic Readiness (1), Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (1), Banham School Maturity Test (1), and AGS First Grade Screening Test (2).

Appropriate pupil behaviors. Thirteen school districts mentioned some type of pupil behaviors that they expected of young children. The following were mentioned: ability to follow directions (8), superior attention span (6), interest in kindergarten-type activities (5), intellectual curiosity (5), ability to relate in a test situation (4), self-direction and independence (4), ability to function in a group (1), peer relations (1), and attitude toward school and learning (1).

Preschool experiences. There were 11 school districts that asked whether the child had any previous experience in a nursery school, Head Start, Sunday school program, montessori school, or day care. Few of the districts requested a report from the teacher in these other settings.

Mental age. Fifty-one districts didn't mention mental age as a criterion. Thirty districts used a general term such as "superior" to describe a bright child. Thirty-five districts reported the I.Q. cutoffs they used in selecting children for early admission; these districts either based this score on the birthdate of the child or had a general cutoff score. For the purpose of this tabulation when mental age was reported, the scores are based on Stanford-Binet equivalencies. Some districts reported as many as four cutoff scores because they based their decision on the age of the child. The scores shown below indicate the cutoff scores used by the thirty-five districts reporting scores:

<u>No. of Districts</u>	<u>Birthdate</u>	<u>Score</u>
1	September	125-130
9	September	130
1	October	130
1	October	130-135
1	October	133
8	October	135
2	November	135
1	November	135-140
4	November	140
1	December	137
2	December	140
1		101-128
6		123-127
1		110
2		115
5		120
1		121
8		130
1		143

AS 008330

Issues to Consider

What Studies Have Been Done on Early Admissions?

Reviews of studies of early admission have been done by Halliwell (1966), Stennett (1966), and others. These reviews point out that many different types of articles are found in the literature on early admissions.

Descriptive reports of early admission programs that have been tried in the public schools can be found. These are not research reports, but merely an account of present practices.

Opinion articles have been written by experts in the field of early education or education for the gifted. These articles, too, are not research reports, but merely a guide to good practice as determined by someone with experience and scholarship in the field.

There have been follow-up studies on children who were admitted to school early. These studies, too, are not research articles but simply historical accounts of what happened to the early entrants.

Follow-up studies have compared early admission children with other students that were matched with them on one or more variables. When early entrants were matched with the regular students in their class, brighter children were found to do better than average children. Other studies that matched bright children who entered school early with bright children who entered later did not match the children on other variables that could have been important. These studies have not been designed well enough to answer for us the question of the effect of early admission on the school experiences of young children.

What Research Design is Needed?

A good research design would require a group of children who are matched on variables such as IQ, sex, socio-economic status, social and emotional adjustment, physical development, previous school experience, etc. From this group of children, two groups would be formed by a random sampling method; children in the two groups would be similar in all characteristics except the age at which they entered school. One group would be allowed to enter school before they were five; the other group would be held out of school until they were five. After the children entered school, the school experiences of the two groups would need to be kept as much the same as possible. An evaluation of the subsequent history of the two groups of children would give us some answers about the effect of early admission on subsequent schooling. It is important to keep in mind that a study of this kind has not yet been done.

Age as a Criterion of School Entrance

The present law requires a standardization of age for children entering school. One school district explains this to parents by saying, "It is customary for the efficient operation of schools that an arbitrary age requirement be established for entrance to kindergarten." Another district, however, says that "chronological age is probably the best single factor to determine

eligibility for admission." Still another district reports that several studies have shown "a definite relationship between pupil achievement in school and age at entrance."

What does it mean when we control the age range of children in kindergarten? The comments of Dunlap suggest that we have a wide variance in mental age of children within this 12-month age span:

If children who enter school for the first time are between 5 and 6 years old, the possible age range is one year lacking one day. These children, in a public school, may vary in ability from 80 I.Q. or lower to 180 I.Q. or higher, an I.Q. range of 100 points or more. In kindergarten, the youngest child (5 years, 0 months, and 0 days), if he happened to be the slowest child, might have an I.Q. of 80 and a mental age of 4 years. Mentally, he would function more like a four- than a five-year-old. The oldest child (5 years, 11 months, and 30 days), if he happened to be the brightest child, might have an I.Q. of 180 and a mental age of 10 years, 10 months. Mentally, his functioning would tend to approach that of a child 10 years old. These extremes provide a mental age range of 6 years and 10 months on the first day of school (Dunlap, 1967, p. 151).

Ilg and Ames suggest that age is of limited usefulness in making decisions on which children will do well in school; they state:

The main weakness of chronological age as a criterion for school entrance is that even if we could determine exactly the age at which the average girl or boy is ready to start kindergarten or first grade, any average would still imply that only 50% of any group of children might be expected to fall close enough to this average to insure their reasonable readiness (Ilg and Ames, 1965, pp. 15-16).

For Whom Should Early Admission be Considered?

Disadvantaged. The law which requires districts to establish a policy for admission of "selected pupils at an earlier age" by no means excludes a policy that would allow children to be admitted on the basis of need, but it has not been interpreted to apply to this group of children by any school district except Grand Rapids. Districts that would like to provide an early experience for children with special needs might consider criteria such as:

- disorganized family due to unemployment, illness, death, divorce, etc.
- family history of poor school achievement
- limited opportunities for growth experiences at home
- lack of knowledge of the English language
- isolation from most adults and peers
- limited language development
- few social skills
- poor motor coordination

Gifted. Early admissions has been used as a method of acceleration, a way to modify the regular educational program to enable a pupil to complete the school curriculum in less time or at an earlier age than is usual. The pros and cons of whether early admission to school is appropriate for gifted children have been discussed in the literature.

Arguments for admitting gifted children to school at an early age include some of the following reasons:

Time factors

- It saves a year of the pupil's life. If 3% of school children could save one year each by acceleration, "our country would have gained for its use more than 1,000,000 years of its best brains in a single generation" (Worcester, 1956).
- Children have critical periods for learning, and training can be introduced too late.
- Increases in the length of training programs results in adults entering professions and reaching adult status late in life.
- Some people (Lehman, 1953) suggest that early adulthood is the most creative and productive period of life.

Schooling factors

- Education of the child will be directed.
- The problem of skipping material in the curriculum is obviated.
- The child will be placed with those more nearly his mental and social equals and he will be less likely to develop habits of dawdling and laziness.
- It adds to the child's enjoyment by placing him in a stimulating environment.
- Any subject can be taught effectively in some intellectually honest form to any child at any stage of development (Bruner, 1960).
- Teachers are made more aware of the needs of bright children by recognizing them in the beginning.
- The school system is more sensitive to needs of the gifted.

Arguments against admitting gifted children to school at an early age include some of the following reasons:

Child development factors

- Some children who enter school early find it is not an advantage for them at puberty, high school, or college.
- There is a concern for not pushing children or putting too much pressure on them in the early years.
- Advantages in participating on athletic teams may occur by keeping children with their age-mates.
- Success in learning to read is dependent on a mental age of 6 or 6 1/2.
- Children are incapable of critical thinking before the ages of 7 or 8.

Administrative factors

- Acceleration should not be more than 2 school years. Since there are acceleration programs at the elementary level, it would be better to promote children a second time in high school rather than allowing early admissions.
- The expense of the program in dollars and time in relationship to the number of children involved is too great.
- I.Q. tests are most costly because they must be individual and the tests are least reliable at these early ages.
- The negative reaction of parents who are denied this privilege is undesirable.
- Nongraded or continuous progress programs take care of the need for early admission.
- Policy decisions on early admission require predictions from preschool measures to in-school reactions of students.

How Does the School Program Affect Early Admissions?

Knowledge of the school program is critical to making good decisions on early admissions. By knowing what type of program the school offers, it is possible to consider the prerequisite skills of children for existing programs. In school districts where there are no expectations for performance because the program is built on the needs and interests of students, the entrance age of a child can be lower. If, however, the school district is committed to a rigid program of skill development, there will be expectations for children and it becomes important to assess their level of development in terms of the requirements of the school program.

Where districts attempt to instruct children of all stages of development in a single large group, it is less possible to provide for those children who are at either extreme on the continuum of competency. Children with high ability will be more likely to find the program unchallenging if they are admitted to school at the same time as their age-mates; early admission for these children might meet their needs in kindergarten. Children with low ability will be likely to find the program beyond their grasp if they are not given the opportunity to acquire the prerequisite experiences and skills. Bringing children of low ability into school earlier will not remedy the difficulty if the program remains a constant, because an additional year of kindergarten will not give these children the different instruction they need.

In school districts that attempt to individualize instruction, the gifted child will be able to find a program that moves at the pace he needs whether he is admitted early to school or not; there is less need to bring the child into the school program early to provide a challenge to the student, but it is also less difficult to accommodate the student as an early entrant. In the same way, children of low ability can be brought into an individualized kindergarten program when they are underage and a continuous progress program would allow a child to spend two years in kindergarten without experiencing failure.

What are Some of the Issues Surrounding Readiness?

There is general agreement that certain kinds of learning take place much more readily at one age than at another. Jensen (1969) and Ogletree (1973) provide some discussion on readiness that is helpful in clarifying two divergent theories of readiness. The theories are useful in telling us where a child is in his development and what the child can accomplish; they are not explanatory theories that tell us how or why different stages occur.

The learning theorist makes use of a cumulative learning model. The degree of readiness for learning at any given age is merely the product of the amount and nature of the learner's previous experience. Readiness is the amount of previous experience that can transfer to new learning.

The maturational theorist considers that the basic configurations correlations and successions of behavior patterns are determined by the innate process of growth called maturation. The individual's behavioral development is essentially predetermined.

Both Jensen and Ogletree consider that both theories are necessary for an understanding of readiness and that "the child's readiness is determined by physical and mental maturation and his experiences or interaction with the environment" (Ogletree, 1973, p. 2).

Questions to Ask

Perspectives of Parents

For some parents this is their first contact with the public school their child will be attending and from it they will be gaining impressions of the instruction. They might be asking:

- Do the personnel in the school have resources to evaluate my child?
- Do resources lie outside the school in some other agency?
- How much is our judgment of our child valued?
- What information does the school want from us?
- What information does the school give us about the experience of kindergarten in our district?
- Does the school see its responsibility for our child as dependent on the age of the child or is there a commitment to us as taxpayers in the district and as future parents of children in the school?

Perspectives of Teachers

For teachers it is important to consider what effect there will be in the kindergarten group of an underage child.

- How important is age for grouping?
- Is it possible to group children by ability?
- Do tests measure the ability of students?
- Will a child retain the characteristic that made selection for a particular group desirable in the first place?
- Does grouping promote desirable attitudes about oneself and others?

Perspectives of Administrators

An administrator needs to have some idea of the school situation which might await a child who would enter school early. He also needs to have a perspective of what community expectations are likely to be.

- How much space is available in the school for additional children?
- What are the present teaching loads like in the kindergarten?
- What is the average intelligence of children in our school district?
- What is the school program like? How flexible is the program to student needs?
- How available are the school personnel or outside personnel needed to screen and evaluate children?
- What would be the dollar costs of selecting and evaluating early entrants?
- What type of criteria need to be established?
- How can this program be interpreted to the school staff, to parents, to the school board and to the community?

Perspectives of Psychologists

Psychologists, who have been given a tremendous amount of decision-making power in the selection of children for early admission to school, might ask questions such as:

- How reliable are individual intelligence tests for preschool children?
- How valid are these tests for minority-group children?
- How relevant is my clinical experience to a placement decision in kindergarten in this particular community? Have I ever visited the kindergartens?
- What are the contrasting theories about readiness and whether it is acquired or developed by maturation?
- Should good articulation be stressed in evaluating preschool children?
- How wide-spread are preschool experiences for young children and how important are they in making decisions on early admission?

References

- Bruner, J. S. The process of education. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1960.
- Dunlap, J. M. The education of children with high mental ability. In W. M. Cruickshank and G. O. Johnson (Ed.) Education of exceptional children and youth, (2nd ed.), Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1967.
- Halliwel, J. W. Reviewing the reviews on entrance age and school success. Journal of Educational Research, 1966, 59, 305-401.
- Ilg, F. L. and Ames, L. B. School readiness. New York: Harper and Row, 1965.
- Jensen, A. R. Understanding readiness: An occasional paper. Urbana, Ill.: U. of Ill. Press, 1969.
- Lehman, H. C. Age and achievement. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton Univ. Press, 1953.
- Ogletree E. Understanding readiness: A rationale. Urbana, Ill.: ERIC Clearinghouse, 1973.
- Stennett, R. G. Early entry to kindergarten: A critical review of the relevant research. Special Education in Canada, 1969, 44 (1), 30-36.
- Worcester, D. A. The education of children of above-average mentality. Lincoln: Univ. of Nebraska Press, 1956.

Resources

- 1) Tabulations of the information provided by the 115 Minnesota school districts reporting early admission policies in 1972-73. These tabulations contain the information that is presented in summary form in this report.
- 2) A copy of the article listed above by R. G. Stennett is available from the State; this article has an extensive bibliography that was not printed in the journal reference.

Copies of either or both of these documents can be obtained from: Minnesota State Department of Education, 550 Cedar Street, Room 654, St. Paul, MN 55101.

- 3) The 1971 legislature provided a half-unit of state aid for preschool handicapped children (Sec. 120.17, subd. 1; Sec. 124.17, subd. 1). This allows handicapped children to be served from birth to age four for all disability areas except mental retardation where the permissive legislation is from birth to age 5. Mandatory legislation covers services for handicapped children beginning at age 5 for mental retardation and at age 4 for all other disabilities. To provide guidance to school districts, a document, Educational Guidelines: Preschool Programs for Handicapped Children, has been developed and is being edited for release to school districts by the Special Education Section of the State Department of Education.

APPENDIX

Early Admission Policy 1972-73

Name of School District	Policy		No Kdg.	No Response	Type of Policy	
	Yes	No			Rely on Psychological Testing	Preliminary Interview & Psy. Test
Ada	X					X
Adrian		X				
Aitkin	X					X
Akeley	X				X	
Albany		X				
Albert Lea		X				
Alden		X				
Alexandria	X				X	
Alvarado		X	X			
Amboy-Good Thunder		X				
Annandale	X				X	
Anoka		X				
Appleton	X				X	
Argyle		X				
Arlington		X				
Ashby	X			X		
Askov		X				
Atwater		X				
Audubon		X				
Aurora-Hoyt Lakes	X				X	
Austin		X				
Babbitt		X				
Backus		X				
Badger		X	X			
Bagley		X	X			
Balaton		X				
Barnesville	X				X	
Barnum		X				
Barrett		X				
Battle Lake		X	X			
Beardsley		X	X			
Becker		X				
Belgrade		X				
Belle Plaine	X				X	

Early Admission Policy 1972-73

Name of School District	Policy		No Kdg.	No Response	Type of Policy		Follow Some of 1962 Guidelines
	Yes	No			Rely on Psychological Testing	Preliminary Interview & Psy. Test	
Bellingham	X						
Belview		X					
Bemidji				X			
Benson	X						
Bertha-Hewitt	X						
Big Lake	X						
Bird Island							X
Biwabik	X						
Blackduck	X				X		
Blooming Prairie	X						
Bloomington	X						X
Blue Earth	X						
Borup	X		X				
Braham	X						
Brainerd	X				X		
Brandon	X			X			
Breckenridge							
Brewster	X						
Bricelyn	X						
Brooklyn Center	X						
Brootten	X						
Browerville	X						
Browns Valley	X						
Brownton	X						
Buffalo	X						
Buffalo Lake	X			X			
Buhl	X						
Burnsville	X						X
Butterfiled	X						
Byron	X				X		
Caledonia	X						
Cambridge	X						
Campbell-Tintah	X			X			
Canby	X						
Cannon Falls	X						X
Carlton	X						X
Cass Lake	X						

Early Admission Policy 1972-73

Name of School District	Policy		No Kdg.	No Response	Type of Policy	
	Yes	No			Rely on Psychological Testing	Preliminary Interview & Psy. Test
Centennial	X					X
Ceylon		X				
Chandler-Lake Wilson	X	X				
Chaska					X	
Chatfield						X
Chisago-Lakes	X				X	
Chisholm	X				X	
Chokio-Alberta		X				
Clara City		X		X		
Claremont		X		X		
Clarissa						
Clarkfield	X			X		
Clearbrook	X				X	
Cleveland						
Climax		X		X		
Clinton		X		X		
Cloquet		X				
Cold Spring	X				X	
Coleraine		X				
Columbia Heights	X					X
Comfrey		X				
Cook County (Grand Marais)	X				X	
Cosmos	X				X	
Cottonwood		X				
Cromwell		X				
Crookston	X					X
Crosby	X					X
Cyrus		X				
Dakota		X				
Danube		X				
Dassel-Cokato	X					X
Dawson		X				
Deer Creek		X				
Deer River		X		X		
Delano		X				

Early Admission Policy 1972-73

Name of School District	Policy		No Response	Type of Policy		Follow Some of 1962 Guidelines
	Yes	No Kdg.		Rely on Psychological Testing	Preliminary Interview & Psy. Test	
Delavan	X					
Detroit Lakes	X					
Dilworth	X					
Dodge Center	X					
Dover-Eyota	X					
Duluth	X				X	
Eagle Bend	X					
East Chain	X		X			
East Grand Forks	X					
Echo	X					
Eden Prairie	X			X		
Eden Valley	X					
Edgerton	X					
Edina	X					
Elbow Lake	X					
Elgin	X					
Elk River	X					X
Ellendale-Geneva	X					
Ellsworth	X					
Elmore	X					
Ely	X			X		
Emmons	X					
Erskine	X					
Evansville	X			X		
Eveleth	X					
Fairfax	X		X			
Fairmont	X					
Faribault	X					
Farmington	X	X				
Fergus Falls	X			X		
Fertile	X					
Finlayson	X					
Fisher	X					
Floodwood	X					
Foley	X					X
Forest Lake	X					

Early Admission Policy 1972-73

Name of School District	Policy		No Kdg.	No Response	Type of Policy		Follow Some of 1962 Guidelines
	Yes	No			Rely on Psychological Testing	Preliminary Interview & Psy. Test	
Fosston	X						
Franklin		X					
Frazee	X				X		
Freeborn		X					
Fridley	X				X		
Frost		X					
Fulda		X					
Garden City		X					
Gary		X					
Gaylord		X					
Gibbon		X					
Gilbert		X					
Glencoe		X					
Glenville	X			X			
Glenwood		X					
Glyndon-Felton		X					
Golden Valley		X		X			
Gonvick	X						
Goodhue		X					
Goodridge		X					
Graceville	X			X			
Granada-Huntley		X					
Grand Meadow		X					
Grand Rapids	X				X		
Granite Falls	X				X		
Greenbush	X				X		
Grey Eagle		X					
Grove City	X			X			
Grygla		X					
Hallock	X						X
Halstad		X					
Hancock		X					
Harmony		X					
Hastings		X					
Hawley	X					X	
Hayfield		X					

Early Admission Policy 1972-73

Name of School District	Type of Policy			
	Policy Yes	Policy No	No Response	Rely on Psychological Testing
Hector	X		X	
Henderson		X		
Hendricks		X		
Hendrum		X		
Henning		X		
Herman		X		
Hermantown				X
Heron Lake	X			
Hibbing		X		
Hill City		X		
Hills-Beaver Creek	X			X
Hinckley	X			X
Hoffman	X			
Holdingsford	X		X	
Hopkins		X		
Houston		X		
Howard Lake	X			X
Humboldt	X			
Hutchinson	X			X
International Falls		X		
Inver Grove	X			X
Isle		X		
Ivanhoe		X		
Jackson	X			X
Janesville	X			X
Jasper		X		
Jordan	X			X
Karlstad	X			X
Kasson-Mantorville	X		X	
Kelliher		X		
Kennedy		X		
Kensington		X		
Kenyon	X			X
Kerkhoven-Sunburg		X		
Kiester		X		
Kimball	X			X

Early Admission Policy 1972-73

Name of School District	Type of Policy					
	Policy Yes	Policy No	No Response	Relay on Psychological Testing	Preliminary Interview & Psy. Test	Follow Some of 1962 Guidelines
La Crescent	X					
Lake Benton			X			
Lake City	X					
Lake County	X					
Lake Crystal	X					X
Lake Park	X					
Lake of the Woods	X					
Lakefield	X					
Lakeville	X					X
Lamberton	X					
Lancaster	X		X			
Lanesboro	X					
Laporte	X				X	
Le Center	X					
Le Roy	X					
Le Sueur	X					
Lester Prairie	X				X	
Lewiston	X				X	
Litchfield	X				X	
Little Falls						
Littlefork	X					
Long Prairie	X		X			
Luverne	X					
Lyle	X					
Lynd	X				X	
Mabel-Canton						
Madelia	X					
Madison	X					
Magnolia	X					
Mahnomen	X					
Mahtomedi	X					
Mankato					X	
Maple Lake	X					
Mapleton	X					
Marietta	X					

Early Admission Policy 1972-73

Name of School District	Policy		No Response	Type of Policy		
	Yes	No		Rely on Psychological Testing	Preliminary Interview & Psy. Test	Follow Some of 1962 Guidelines
Marshall	X					
Maynard	X					
Mazeppa	X	X				
McGregor	X					
McIntosh	X					
Medford	X					
Melrose	X			X		
Menahga	X					
Mentor	X					
Middle River	X					
Milaca	X			X		
Milan	X					
Milroy	X				X	
Minneapolis	X					
Minneota	X					
Minnesota Lake	X					X
Minnetonka	X					
Montevideo	X			X		
Montgomery	X	X				
Monticello	X				X	
Moorhead	X					X
Moose Lake	X			X		
Mora	X					
Morgan	X					
Morris	X				X	
Morristown	X					
Morton	X	X				
Motley	X					
Mound	X				X	
Mounds View	X				X	
Mountain Iron	X					
Mountain Lake	X					
Murdock	X					
Nashwauk	X					
Nett Lake	X					
Nevis	X					
Newfoiden	X		X			

Early Admission Policy 1972-73

Name of School District	Policy		No Response		Type of Policy		Follow Some of 1962 Guidelines
	Yes	No	No	Kdg.	Rely on Psychological Testing	Preliminary Interview & Psy. Test	
New London-Spicco	X						
New Prague	X						
New Richland	X						
New Ulm	X						
New York Mills	X						
Nicollet	X				X		
North Branch		X			X		
Northfield	X				X		
North St. Paul	X				X		
Norwood	X				X		
Ogilvie			X				
Okabena			X				
Oklee			X				
Olivia			X				
Onamia	X					X	
Orono	X						X
Ortonville			X				
Osakis			X				
Oslo			X				
Osseo	X					X	
Owatonna			X				
Park Rapids	X		X				
Parkers Prairie	X		X				
Paynesville	X		X				
Pelican Rapids	X		X				
Pequot Lakes	X		X				
Perham	X		X				
Peterson	X		X				
Pierz	X		X				
Pillager	X		X				
Pine City	X		X				
Pine Island	X		X				
Pine River	X		X				
Pipestone	X		X				
Plainview	X		X				
Plummer							
Preston	X						X

Name of School District	Type of Policy					
	Policy Yes	Policy No	No Response	Rely on Psychological Testing	Preliminary Interview & Psy. Test	Follow Some of 1962 Guidelines
Princeton	X			X		
Prinsburg		X				
Prior Lake	X			X		
Proctor		X				
Randolph		X				
Raymond		X				
Red Lake		X				
Red Lake Falls	X			X		
Red Wing		X				
Redwood Falls	X			X		
Remer		X				
Renville		X				
Richfield		X				
Robbinsdale		X				
Rochester	X			X		
Rockford		X				
Roseau	X			X		
Rosemount	X					
Roseville	X					
Rothsay		X				
Round Lake		X				
Royalton		X				
Rush City		X				
Rushford		X				
Russell		X				
Ruthton		X				
Sacred Heart	X					
St. Anthony Village	X			X?		
St. Charles		X				
St. Clair		X				
St. Cloud	X					
St. Francis	X			X?		
St. James		X				
St. Louis County Unorg.		X				
St. Louis Park	X					
St. Michael-Albertville	X			X		
St. Paul	X			X		



Early Admission Policy 1972-73

Name of School District	Policy		No Kdg.	No Response	Type of Policy		
	Yes	No			Rely on Psychological Testing	Preliminary Interview & Psy. Test	Follow Some of 1962 Guidelines
St. Peter	X						
Sanborn	X						
Sandstone	X						
Sartell	X				X		
Sauk Centre	X				X		
Sauk Rapids	X				X		
Sebeka	X				X		
Shakopee	X						X
Sherburn	X						
Silver Lake	X			X			
Sioux Valley	X		X				
Slayton	X						
Sleepy Eye	X			X			
South Koochiching	X		X				
South St. Paul	X						
South Washington County	X					X	
Southland	X						
Springfield	X						
Spring Grove	X						
Spring Lake Park	X						X
Spring Valley	X						
Staples	X						
Starbuck	X						
Stephen	X						
Stewart	X						
Stewartville	X						
Stillwater	X						X
Storden-Jeffers	X						
Strandquist	X		X				
Swanville	X						
Taylor Falls	X						
Thief River Falls	X						
Thomson Township	X			X			
Tower-Soudan	X						
Tracy	X					X	
Tri-Mont	X						

Early Admission Policy 1972-73

Name of School District	Policy			Type of Policy		
	Yes	No	No Response	Rely on Psychological Testing	Preliminary Interview & Psy. Test	Follow Some of 1962 Guidelines
Truman	X					
Twin Valley	X					
Tyler	X					
Ulen-Hitterdal	X	X				
Underwood	X	X				
Upsala	X					
Verdi	X	X				
Verndale	X					
Villard	X					
Virginia	X					
Wabasha	X				X	
Wabasso	X			X		
Waconia	X			X		
Wadena	X					
Waldorf-Pemberton	X					
Walker	X					
Walnut Grove	X					
Wanamingo	X					
Warren	X					
Warroad	X					
Waseca	X					
Watertown	X			X		
Waterville-Elysian	X			X		
Waubun	X					
Wayzata	X				X	
Welcome	X					
Wells	X					
Westbrook	X					
West Concord	X					
West St. Paul	X					
Wheaton	X				X	
White Bear Lake	X					
Willmar	X			X		
Willow River	X					
Windom	X					
Winnepago	X					

Early Admission Policy 1972-73

Name of School District	Policy		No Kdg.	No Response	Type of Policy		
	Yes	No			Rely on Psychological Testing	Preliminary Interview & Psy. Test	Follow Some of 1962 Guidelines
Winona	X		X				
Winsted							X
Winthrop			X				
Wood Lake			X				
Worthington			X				
Wrenshall			X				
Wykoff			X				
Zumbrota			X				