DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 025 860 EA 001 997

Analysis and Evaluation of 137 ESEA Title III Planning and Operational Grants. Report No. 4 of the Second National Study of PACE.

Center for Effecting Educational Change, Fairfax, Va.

Spons Agency-Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education.
Report No-ESEA Title 3
Pub Date 15 Nov 68
Note-77p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$3.95
Descriptors-*Educational Innovation, *Federal Programs, Problems, *Program Content, Program Design, *Program Effectiveness, *Program Evaluation, Program Guides, Program Length, Statistical Surveys
Identifiers-ESEA Title 3, PACE, *Projects to Advance Creativity in Education

This report is an assessment of the overall impact and influence on education of 137 terminated Planning and Operational Grants made under the ESEA Title III Projects to Advance Creativity in Education (PACE) program. Analysis and evaluation seek to determine whether (1) individual project objectives were identified and achieved, (2) PACE participation resulted in educational changes or improvements, (3) school districts were motivated to continue their programs through local funding and initiative, and (4) expenditures, efforts, and activity generated by PACE are justified in terms of outcomes. To accomplish these objectives, an evaluation instrument (appended) is used to investigate project characteristics, project accomplishments, provisions for continuation, project design, and final appraisals. Major problems mentioned most often in conjunction with the projects include project finance, public relations, lack of clear planning and objectives, lack of qualified personnel, problems of implementation, and lack of official cooperation. The overall appraisal rated 76 projects as outstanding or good while only 61 were rated as average or below. Nine specific recommendations are made to aid the quality and continuation of future PACE projects. (TT)

ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION
OF
137 ESEA TITLE III PLANNING
AND
OPERATIONAL GRANTS

Report No. 4
of
The Second National Study of PACE

November 15, 1968

ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION

OF

137 ESEA TITLE III PLANNING AND OPERATIONAL GRANTS

Report No. 4

of

The Second National Study of PACE

November 15, 1968

Reports of the Second National Study of PACE

1. Evaluation and "PACE": A Study of Procedures and Effectiveness of Evaluation Sections in Approved PACE Projects with Recommendations for Improvement. February 29, 1968. 270 pp.

2. The Continuation and Strengthening of ESEA Title III. March 4, 1968. 2 pp.

3. A Comprehensive Model for Managing an ESEA Title III Project from Conception to Culmination. November 10, 1968. 95 pp.

4. Analysis and Evaluation of 137 ESEA Title III Planning and Operational Grants. November 15, 1968. 69 pp.

5. The Views of 920 PACE Project Directors. November 20, 1968.

6. PACE: Catalyst for Change. November 29, 1968.

SECOND PACE NATIONAL STUDY

(1967-1968)

Special Consultants

William M. Alexander
Director, Institute for Curriculum Improvement
College of Education
University of Florida

Glenn O. Blough
Professor of Education
University of Maryland

Don Bushnell
Vice President and Director
Research and Development
Brooks Foundation
Santa Barbara, California

Don Davies
Former Executive Secretary,
National Commission on
Teacher Education and Professional Standards
National Education Association

Lloyd M. Dunn
Director, Institute on Mental
Retardation and Intellectual
Development
George Peabody College for Teachers

Elliot W. Eisner
Associate Professor of Education
and Art
School of Education
Stanford University

James D. Finn
Chairman, Department of
Instructional Technology
University of Southern California

Dorothy Fraser
Coordinator of Social
Science
College of Education
Hunter College of the City
University of New York

Egon G. Guba
Director, National Institute for the Study of
Educational Change
Indiana University

Robert J. Havighurst
Professor of Education
School of Education
University of Chicago

Maurie Hillson
Professor of Education
Graduate School of Education
Rutgers, The State University

Arthur A. Hitchcock
Professor of Education
State University of New
York at Albany

Norman D. Kurland
Director, Center on Innovation in Education
The State Education Department
Albany, New York

John W. Letson
Superintendent of Schools
Atlanta Public Schools

A. Harry Passow
Professor of Education
Teachers College, Columbia University

Joseph B. Rubin
Teacher, Chapman Elementary School
Portland, Oregon

Wilbur Schramm
Director, Institute for Communication Research
Stanford University

Ira J. Singer
Assistant Superintendent
West Hartford Public Schools

Robert E. Stake
Associate Director, Center for Instructional Research and Curriculum Evaluation
University of Illinois

Special Advisors

Harold B. Gores
President, Educational Facilities Laboratories, Inc.
New York, New York

Donald W. Johnson
Former Director, Program Planning and Development
California State Department of Education
Sacramento, California

Daniel L. Stufflebeam
Director, The Evaluation Center
The Ohio State University

PACE Project Directors' Advisory Group

Robert L. Hammond
Former Director, Project EPIC
Tucson, Arizona

Arthur R. King
Director, Hawaiian Curriculum Center
State Department of Education
Honolulu, Hawaii

Donald R. Miller
Director, Operation PEP
Burlingame, California

George G. Tankard, Jr.
Director, Center for Effecting Educational Change
Fairfax, Virginia

Shelley Umans
Director, PACE Activities for New York City
New York, New York

Table of Contents

Introduction

Terminal reporting has become a matter for concern now that many projects are coming up to the three-year cutoff point. It is interesting to note that the first USOE guidelines (1965) that were given in the manual for project applicants did not even make mention of terminal considerations, and the 1966 and the 1967 revised versions do mention an end-of-grant report but give only the barest suggestions as to what it should contain.

This report is an effort to determine the contents of 137 randomly selected terminated planning and operational ESEA Title III grants.

One should take into account the fact that most of the 137 projects represented early-funded projects. Later projects, beginning with the second year, have displayed a more sophisticated approach.

Also, our paper analysis should be considered in light of the great difficulty of judging field success—where it really counts—of the project as opposed to the paper picture. Members of the PACE national study team have been impressed by what they found in the field as compared with the project proposals. So one must view findings from analyses of terminal reports, no matter how carefully undertaken, with some skepticism.

With an understanding of the limitations of our "paper tiger," nevertheless, we believe it represents a useful dimension of this second national effort. Every project is required to submit a terminal report. From these efforts, one should be able to glean something about how public money has been used to improve public education.

A four-man study steam was coordinated by Charles F. Martin, assistant professor of education, University of Kentucky, who also did a major portion of the final analysis. The team members brought varied and well-rounded backgrounds to the study, with two members having a total of 32 years of public school teaching and administration, and the other two having predominately college teaching and research experience. The other three team members were: Russell Bowen, graduate assistant, Department of Curriculum and Instruction, University of Kentucky; Art Lucky, psychologist, State Department of Health, Frankfort, Kentucky; and John R. Payne, assistant professor of education, Virginia Polytechnic Institute.

This study is sponsored by an ESEA Title III grant, to the Center for Effecting Educational Change, Fairfax County, Virginia, which subcontracted the assignment to the University of Kentucky's Research Foundation.

Richard I. Miller
Director of Study
November 15, 1968

ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION

OF

137 ESEA TITLE III PLANNING AND OPERATIONAL GRANTS

The general objectives of the study were to determine the overall influence and impact on education of a sample of terminated ESEA Title III Operational and Planning Grants. The five major areas in the evaluation instrument included: project characteristics, project accomplishments, provisions for continuation, project design, and final appraisals. (A copy of the evaluation instrument is included as Appendix A.) Specifically, the study sought to:

1. Provide a statistical report and summary of a sample of terminated Title III Operational and Planning Grants.

2. Determine whether individual project objectives were identified and achieved.

3. Determine whether PACE participation resulted in educational changes and improvements in school districts, including any evidences of direct influences upon students.

4. Determine whether school districts were motivated to continue their programs through local funding and initiative.

5. Determine as much as a paper analysis will allow whether the expenditures, efforts, and intensive activity generated by PACE are justified in terms of outcomes.

Planning and orientation sessions were held to acquaint team members with objectives of the study.

1. The instrument developed for analysis of the reports covered five major areas and several related categories. In addition, the terminated planning grants were analyzed through use of an addendum covering the three specific areas of needs assessment, program development, and possibilities of converting the planning grant into an operational grant. The instruments provided 111 individual checklist opportunities for responses, plus 49 items in the addendum that were applicable only to planning grants.

2. The sample consisted of 94 terminated planning grants and 43 terminated operational grants. Thirty-five states were represented in the planning grants and 28 in the operational grants. The states included all of the geographical areas of the nation.

3. The analysis consisted, in the first instance, of identifying terminated planning and operational grants and separating them from the other types of grants. This task was unexpectedly time consuming and somewhat difficult due to the failure of the many reports to properly and fully complete the official application and report forms. The individual planning and operational grants then were given a code number and the analysis began.

Analysis was accomplished by application of the guidelines instrument. Following the completion of the 94 planning and 43

operational grants, various statistical summaries were compiled. These will be presented in the following section of the report. During the actual analysis the team members conferred freely concerning problems of identification, meaning, intent, content, and so forth.

This report will consist of the following six sections: statistical summaries, project accomplishments, evaluation procedures, major problems, overall appraisal, and recommendations.

STATISTICAL SUMMARIES

This section includes a number of items that are included to assist the reader in understanding the sample of 137 projects upon which this study is based.

These items are:

Number of projects in each submission period
A financial summary
School enrollment and staff involvement
Type of project
Focus of activity
Identification of projects by states
Scope of project
Area served
Types of activity
Types of project
Provisions for continuation

Number of Projects in Each Submission Period

For planning grants

The study covers three funding periods—fiscal year 1966, 1967, and part of 1968. From the first period in 1966 (projects numbering 1-733), 11 projects are analyzed and processed; from the second period of fiscal 1966 (projects numbering 734-1723), 47 projects are analyzed; and the third period (projects numbering 1724-2726), includes 26 projects. Thus a total of 84 of the 94 planning projects analyzed come from the 1966 fiscal year funding period.

For fiscal year 1967, eight projects are analyzed. Three are

from the first 1967 funding period (projects numbering 2727-3152), and five are from the second 1967 funding period (projects numbering 3153-4487). The sample includes two projects from the first period of fiscal year 1968, encompassing projects numbering 4485-5795.

The large number of planning grants in the 1966 fiscal year (91.6 percent as compared to only 9.4 percent for both 1967 and 1968) reflects the fact that ESEA was implemented in 1965 and became operational in 1966. The impetus "to get in on a good thing," the relative ease with which early planning grants were approved and funded, and the pressures from the public and educational establishment for school participation were factors that prompted submission of several hundred project proposals during the first funding period, or very shortly after ESEA became a law.

For operational grants

The first period of 1966 included 10 terminated operational projects; the second period of fiscal 1966 was represented by 17 projects; and the third period of 1966 included 13 projects. Thus a total of 40 projects of the 43 evaluated by the study team originated in fiscal 1966 or immediately following enactment of the ESEA in 1965. The sample included one project from the first period of fiscal 1967, and two from the second submission period of 1967.

The following table summarizes the data for both planning and

operational grants with respect to the number of projects in each submission period.

Fiscal 1966	Planning	Operational	Total
First period	11	10	21
Second period	47	17	64
Third period	26	13	39
Fiscal 1967			
First period	3	1	4
Second period	5	2	7
Fiscal 1968			
First period	2	0	2
Totals	94	43	137

One might ask about the validity of this sample in view of the significant improvement in the quality of proposals submitted during the second year. The question is a legitimate one, and the study team was aware of it in making their analyses and recommendations.

A Financial Summary

For planning grants

The 94 Title III planning grant projects received a total of $5,295,006 during the funding periods encompassed in this report. Of this amount, $588,982 was for non-federal support, largely state or local funds; and the federal support other than ESEA Title III totaled $53,192. Actual federal support for Title III for the three year period included in this study totaled $4,649,747.

For operational grants

The total fiscal allocation for the 43 terminated operational grants was $4,330,579. Of this amount, $661,335 came from non-federal sources. The actual Title III allocation totaled $3,401,807, while federal support from sources other than Title III totaled $265,947. Due to arithmetical errors in the financial section of some individual projects, the total in those reports do not balance exactly.

The following table summarizes the data for both planning and operational grants with respect to project support.

Type of project	ESEA Title III	Other federal	Non-federal	Total
94 planning	4,649,747	53,192	588,982	5,295,006
43 operational	3,401,807	265,947	661,335	4,330,579
Totals	8,051,554	319,139	1,250,317	9,625,585

School Enrollment and Staff Involvement

For planning grants

The 94 planning projects reviewed by the study team encompassed a geographic area containing an estimated total school population of 3,845,018 students. (See table on page 11.) At the pre-kindergarten level, 14,383 public and 1,197 non-public school students were located in the geographic area served by this sample. The total number of kindergarten pupils served in the geographic area included

156, 755 public school pupils and 11, 875 non-public school pupils. In grades one through six, 1, 532, 506 public school pupils and 275, 611 non-public school pupils; and for grades seven through twelve, 655, 724 public and 88, 517 non-public school pupils were totaled.

The distribution of participants, according to race, is: 2, 154, 760 white; 123, 947 negro; 11, 723 American Indian; and 61, 997 other non-white—for a total of 2, 352, 431. (See table on page 13.)

For operational grants

The 43 operational projects encompassed a geographic area containing an estimated school enrollment of 1, 494, 192 students. (See table on page 11.) At the pre-kindergarten level, an estimated 1, 404 public and 390 non-public school students were in the geographic area included in this sample. The estimated total number of kindergarten pupils in the geographic area included 26, 303 public school pupils and 1, 663 non-public school pupils. In grades one through six, 745, 027 public school pupils and 109, 884 non-public school pupils; and for grades seven through twelve the total was 524, 695 public school and 42, 050 non-public school pupils.

Again, the estimated number of pupils actually served by the projects is much smaller than the total geographic population. (See page 11.) At the pre-kindergarten level, 1, 260 public and 184 non-public school pupils were served. At the kindergarten level, 11, 195 public and 274 non-public school pupils were listed; for grades one

Total Potential School Population in Geographic Area

94 Planning Projects 43 Operational Projects

Level	Type		Type		Total		Grand Total
	Public	Non-Public	Public	Non-Public	Public	Non-Public	
Pre-Kindergarten	14,383	1,197	1,404	390	15,287	1,587	17,374
Kindergarten	156,755	11,875	26,303	1,663	183,058	13,538	196,596
Grades 1 - 6	1,532,506	275,611	745,027	109,884	2,277,533	385,495	2,663,028
Grades 7 - 12	1,343,228	163,426	524,695	42,050	1,867,923	205,476	2,073,399
Adults	266,702	4,111	22,395	-------	289,097	4,111	293,208
Other	61,908	13,316	20,336	45	82,244	13,361	95,605
Totals	3,375,482	469,536	1,340,160	154,032			
Sub-Totals	3,845,018		1,494,192				5,339,210

Estimated Student Population Directly Involved

94 Planning Projects 43 Operational Projects

Level	Type		Type		Total		Grand Total
	Public	Non-Public	Public	Non-Public	Public	Non-Public	
Pre-Kindergarten	10,395	973	1,260	184	1,655	1,157	12,812
Kindergarten	72,749	7,981	11,195	274	83,944	8,255	92,199
Grades 1 - 6	645,721	132,128	226,361	14,817	872,082	148,945	1,019,027
Grades 7 - 12	655,724	88,517	156,731	4,192	812,455	93,709	905,164
Adults	201,426	3,071	870	------	202,296	3,071	205,367
Other	52,224	13,730	559	2	52,783	13,732	66,515
Totals	1,638,239	246,400	396,976	19,469			
Sub-Totals	1,884,639		416,445				2,301,084

Estimated Number of Participants, Based Upon Race

Race	Planning	Operational	Total
White	2,154,764	338,123	2,492,887
Negro	123,947	47,420	171,367
American Indian	11,723	3,367	15,090
Other non-White	61,997	1,789	63,786
Totals	2,352,431	390,699	2,743,130

through six, 226,361 public and 14,817 non-public school students were listed; and for grades seven through twelve the total was 156,731 public and 4,192 non-public school pupils.

The distribution of participants, according to race, is: 338,123 white; 47,420 negro; 3,367 American Indian; 1,789 other non-white—for a total of 410,483. (See page 13.)

The preceding tables summarize data on school enrollment and staff involvement.

The reader should not confuse these "ball park" figures with what might actually represent the scope of the project.

The figures do represent some very rough indication of the maximum number of pupils and students that <u>might</u> be influenced by the project under the most favorable conditions. But this quantitative dimension must not be confused with quality, <u>per se</u>.

<u>Type of Project</u>

Of the 94 planning grants, 53 projects were designated as innovative, 32 as exemplary, and two as adaptive. (These categories follow those set up by the USOE guidelines.) A total of seven proposals submitted failed to designate or identify the type of project.

Of the 43 operational grants, 26 were designated as innovative, 14 as exemplary, and three as adaptive.

The following table summarizes the data on this item:

Type	94 Planning	43 Operational	Total
Innovative	53	26	79
Exemplary	32	14	46
Adaptive	2	3	5
No description	7	--	7
Totals	94	43	137

These categories remain elusive. The first national study defined an educational innovation as "a new or different concept, methodology, organization, or program that is systematically introduced into the classroom, school system and/or the State as a whole."

In this sense many projects appeared to be an innovation, but many others seemed to be adaptive. Few could be judged as exemplary.

Focus of Activity

For planning projects

A large majority of the projects—83 in number—concentrated on program planning, and 18 projects conducted pilot studies as associated activities. (Again, these categories were taken from USOE guidelines.) Eight projects planned construction, while seven were designated as operational, and one for remodeling. One project made no response in this category. (The number of activities listed exceeds the total number of projects because some projects sponsored more than one major activity.)

For operational projects

Twenty-five operational projects were judged to have planning as a major activity or program focus. This finding is a little unusual in that one would expect most program planning to take place during the planning grant phase of the program. Thirty-seven projects concentrated on program operation, while 10 conducted various types of pilot activities. Four were devoted primarily to construction of facilities, three to remodeling, and two to planning of construction. (The number of activities exceeds the total number of projects because several projects focused on more than one activity.)

The following table summarizes the findings:

Activity	Planning	Operational	Total
Planning of program	83	25	'108
Planning of construction	8	2	10
Conducting pilot programs	18	10	28
Operation of program	7	37	44
Constructing	0	4	4
Remodeling	1	3	4
Not identifiable	1	---	1
Totals	118	81	199

Identification of Projects by States

For planning grants

The 94 projects were located in 35 of the 50 states. The eight northeast states provided 27 of the projects used in the study; the midwest consisting of eight states provided 21 proposals; the southern

region consisting of nine states provided 19 projects; and the western region consisting of nine states provided 19 projects.

California led in number of projects with nine; Pennsylvania followed with eight, and Michigan, Illinois and New Jersey each had five projects. Three states had four projects in the sample, seven states had three projects each, eight states had two projects each, and 13 states had only one project.

For operational grants

The 43 projects were located in 28 of the 50 states. The western area accounted for 12 projects; the south had 12 projects; the east had 10 projects; and the north had nine.

California led in number of projects with six. Eight states had two projects, and 19 others had a single project.

The following table summarizes the distribution by states:

Distribution of Planning and Operational Grants by States

States	Planning	Operational	Total
Alabama	1	0	1
Alaska	1	0	1
Arizona	0	0	0
Arkansas	1	1	2
California	9	6	15
Colorado	1	0	1
Connecticut	2	1	3
Delaware	2	0	2
District of Columbia	0	0	0
Florida	3	2	5
Georgia	4	0	4
Hawaii	0	0	0

States	Planning	Operational	Total
Idaho	1	1	2
Illinois	5	0	5
Indiana	1	0	1
Iowa	0	1	1
Kansas	2	2	4
Kentucky	1	2	3
Louisiana	3	0	3
Maine	0	0	0
Maryland	1	1	1
Massachusetts	1	2	3
Michigan	5	1	6
Minnesota	3	1	4
Mississippi	0	0	0
Missouri	3	0	3
Montana	1	0	1
Nebraska	0	0	0
Nevada	0	0	0
New Hampshire	3	1	4
New Jersey	5	1	6
New Mexico	2	1	3
New York	3	2	5
North Carolina	2	1	3
North Dakota	0	1	1
Ohio	4	2	6
Oklahoma	0	1	1
Oregon	0	1	1
Pennsylvania	8	2	10
Rhode Island	4	0	4
South Carolina	0	1	1
South Dakota	0	0	0
Tennessee	2	0	2
Texas	3	2	5
Utah	1	1	2
Vermont	0	1	1
Virginia	2	1	3
Washington	1	0	1
West Virginia	0	0	0
Wisconsin	1	1	2
Wyoming	2	0	2
Unidentified	1	2	3

Scope of Project

For planning grants

The scope of the projects indicated that a majority (40) covered one district. Another 40 proposals concentrated on multi-district areas, with 26 in multi-district of seven or more, and 14 were in multi-districts of six or less. Only one regional (projects covering more than one state) and one state project were included in the sample. Five of the projects sampled involved a few schools in one district while four concentrated only on one school in a district. Three projects failed to indicate the scope or limitations of their projects by not responding to this item.

For operational grants

None of the terminated operational projects were national in scope nor did any of them cover an entire region or state. Eleven of the projects focused upon one district, 14 functioned in multi-districts containing two to six different school systems, and six grants operated in multi-districts of seven or more. Seven projects were located in a few schools within a single district, and two projects operated each in one school. The scope of the terminated operational projects compares favorably with the distribution of the Planning Grants in that the majority were located in either one district or in multi-districts. Three projects failed to designate the scope of their projects, and were not included in the report.

The distribution of planning and operational grants is given in the following table:

Scope	Planning	Operational	Total
National	0	0	0
Regional	1	0	1
One state	1	0	1
One district	40	11	51
Multi-district (2 - 6)	14	14	28
Multi-district (7 +)	26	6	32
A few schools in one district	5	7	12
One school	4	2	6
Not identifiable	3	3	6
Totals	94	43	137

Area Served

For planning projects

Approximately 72 projects out of the 94 focused on urban areas while only 21 served rural areas. This is not surprising since the needs of inner-city and large urban area schools are a major thrust for PACE. Twenty-three of the projects served central city areas and 12 served urban fringe areas, and 20 projects were operative in cities of 10,000 or more, while 15 served cities of 2,500 to 10,000.

Twelve projects focused on rural areas—communities of 1,000 to 2,500 and only nine served areas designated as "other rural." Three projects failed to designate the area served by failing to respond to this particular category.

For operational projects

A majority of the projects (18) served either the inner-city or fringe areas; however, an almost equal number were located in suburban areas with 12 projects serving cities of 10,000 or more and five serving cities of from 2,500 to 10,000 population. Rural sections had a much smaller percentage of projects with six located in rural areas of from 1,000 - 2,500 population, and only two operating in rural areas smaller than 2,500 population. As in the case of the planning projects, a large majority of operational projects were concentrated in the inner-city and urban areas.

The following table summarizes the areas served by the 137 projects:

Area	Planning	Operational	Total
Urban			
Central	23	10	33
Urban fringe	12	8	20
Other urban (suburban)			
Cities of 10,000 and over	20	12	32
Cities of 2,500 to 10,000	15	5	20
Rural			
1,000 to 2,500	12	6	20
Other rural	9	9	11
Unidentified	3	0	3
Totals	94	43	139

Types of Activity

For planning grants

The types of activity engaged in by the various projects were varied. Not surprisingly, activities related to planning, surveying needs, designing new programs and visiting innovations were most frequent, with 36 projects giving this category as their prime activity. The second most prevalent activity consisted of services to local schools with 21 projects, and the third most frequently listed category—with 18 projects—was instruction or services to pupils in the arts, social studies, guidance and counseling, and various other activities related to student instruction. Ten projects concentrated on services to teachers and principals, mostly in the areas of in-service training, audio-visuals and instructional materials, and seven projects emphasized the installation of one or two innovations in a single school or two, while two projects failed to indicate their primary focus.

For operational grants

A large majority of the 43 projects, however, concentrated upon instructional services to pupils in the arts, sciences, social studies, etc., by providing mobile labs, ETV, visits to museums and guidance and counseling services. Six of the projects provided administrative planning, dissemination and developmental services to local school districts

The emphasis on various phases of instructional services is to be expected. Seven of the projects provided in-service programs to administrators and teachers in audio-visual training, provisions for instructional materials, and demonstrations of programs. Only three programs out of a total of 137 projects surveyed involved the installation of innovations in one or two schools, and no programs were concerned with activities such as surveying needs, visiting other innovations, or planning for these activities.

The following table summarizes the types of activities found in the 137 projects. (The total number of operational projects exceeds the 137 figure because a few projects were judged as having two or more major functions.)

Type of Activity	Planning	Operational	Total
a. Mostly instruction or services to pupils, such as arts, sciences, social studies, mobile demonstration, museum visits, ETV, outdoor camping, and guidance and counseling.	18	36	54
b. Mostly planning, such as surveying needs, designing new programs, and visiting innovations	36	0	36
c. Mostly services to several local school districts, such as administration, dissemination, planning, and developing	21	6	27

Type of Activity	Planning	Operational	Total
d. Mostly services to teachers and principals—services such as instructional materials, audio-visual, demonstrations, and in-service training	10	7	17
e. Mostly installation of one or two innovations in one or two schools—innovations such as ITA, computer-assisted instruction, teaching aides, parent involvement, job placement, and new courses	7	3	10
f. Not indicated	2	0	2
Totals	94	52	146

Types of Project

For planning projects

The 94 PACE planning projects were almost evenly divided in terms of focus: Forty-six concentrated upon a sirgle idea or program, while 45 were planning to serve as supplementary centers usually with several programs or activities. Three projects failed to indicate an area of concentration.

For operational projects

Twenty-seven of these projects focused upon a single idea or program, or about 62% of the total number. The remaining number of grants (16) concentrated on organizing or providing various types of supplementary educational centers.

The following table summarizes the types of projects found in the 137 projects:

Focus	Planning	Operational	Total
Upon single idea or program	46	27	73
Supplementary center program	45	16	61
No indication	3	0	3
Totals	94	43	137

Addendum for Planning Grants

As was noted on page four of this report, a special addendum covering the specific areas of (1) needs assessment, (2) program development and (3) possibilities for converting planning grants into continuation grants, was used in analysis of the 94 planning grants sampled.

The study team determined where a needs assessessment study had been made as an aspect of the planning grant. Thirty-six projects were judged to have done so, and 57 projects had not made a needs assessment study.

A second part of this criterion determined what community and school factors were used in those 36 projects that did conduct an assessment study to determine their needs. The two leading community factors were (1) rural-urban composition and (2) socio-economic class, with 12 responses each. Eleven projects indicated that

employment patterns were important community considerations, while nine projects listed attitudinal considerations as the most prominent community factor used.

Among the other community variables used by the study team were median family income, median grade attainment, and horizontal mobility, with four each; and the school variable, per pupil expenditure with five responses. Some six projects indicated that pupil and community needs were important community factors; however, this appears to be a dual category including both community and school factors.

Turning to the school factors used in the assessment studies, 14 projects used composition of the student body, student achievement measures and the socio-economic class structure of the school system were used by eight projects each. Five projects used study needs as a school factor in needs assessment.

Community and school variables used by the 36 (out of 94) projects that conducted needs assessment studies are summarized in the following table:

Community factors*/	Frequency used
a. Rural-urban composition	12
b. Socio-economic composition	12
c. Employment patterns	11
d. Attitudinal considerations	9
e. Per pupil expenditure	5
f. Median family income	4
g. Median grade attained	4
h. Horizontal mobility	4
i. Other	3

School factors	Frequency used
a. Composition of student body	14
b. Socio-economic class structure of school system	8
c. Student achievement measures	8
d. Other	3

---

*/ The number of community factors used exceeds the total number of projects because several projects used more than one procedure to assess needs.

PROJECT ACCOMPLISHMENTS

The second category appraised by the study team covered 11 items related to project accomplishments.

Accomplishments on the 137 projects were rated in terms of what the project authors said was achieved.

The 11 items were:

Research
Product development
Skill development
Process development
Program development
Pupil relations
Community relations
In-service programs for teachers
Demonstration
Dissemination
Implementation
Provisions for continuation

Research

Twenty-three terminal planning project reports, or 24 percent, had some type of research design that was related logically to the program. Fifteen of these 23 projects had accomplishments that appeared significant in terms of potential contributions.

In three cases the accomplishments were considered to be overstated, and in 11 projects the accomplishments were defined as

"ordinary." The accomplishments of two out of the 23 projects were rated as "trite or insignificant."

For 76 percent of the terminal reports, however, no research design or research attention was evident.

Nineteen terminated operational project reports, or 44 percent, were judged as having research-oriented programs, or as having used research methodology in planning, operational procedures and/or evaluation. Research procedures in 18 of the 19 projects appeared to flow orderly and logically from the program, but in only one project did the claimed accomplishments in terms of research appear to offer significant contributions.

Product Development

This area refers to the development of new programs and materials such as curriculum innovations or aids for the handicapped.

Activities in 45 planning projects fitted into this category, and 22 of this number were judged to have accomplishments flowing logically from the programs. Fifteen of the 45 were credited with having accomplishments that were significant in terms of potential contributions. Accomplishments in three of the 45 programs were judged as being over-stated, and the accomplishments in one program were judged to be trite or insignificant.

Product development activities in 16 operational projects

seemed to originate and to flow logically from the project's overall program, and three projects in product development presented accomplishments that seemed capable of making significant contributions. One claim made by the project authors was judged to be "trite or insignificant" by the reviewers.

Skill Development

Activities in eight terminal planning reports could be classified as skill development, which included activities such as new mathematics, foreign languages, and the Initial Teaching Alphabet (ITA). Five of these eight were rated as flowing logically from the program, and three of the activities presented accomplishments judged to be significant.

Fourteen operational projects had skill development in subject matter areas such as reading, mathematics, and the social sciences as their major goal. Of this number, 13 projects were credited with flowing logically from the program. One other project was judged to have made claims that were "trite or insignificant" and not likely to make a significant contribution.

Process Development

Eleven projects stressed process development such as inquiry training and critical thinking. Five of the 11 projects were judged to

have accomplishments that could make potential contributions in process development; five were appraised as claiming accomplishments that were "ordinary;" and only one project was judged to have made an orderly or "flow" transition from the project. Four out of the 43 operational projects had some form of process development as an integral part of their total efforts. These four programs were judged to flow logically from the project itself; however, none was judged as likely to make significant contributions to education in their area.

Program Development

Some 52 planning projects featured various types of program developments such as computer assisted instruction, non-graded schools, special science programs, and team teaching. One program accomplishment was judged to be "overstated;" ten were appraised as being "ordinary;" 18 programs seemed to flow logically from the project; and 22 were judged significant in terms of potential contributions.

Four projects included some aspect of computer technology as a major dimension. One focused on computer assisted instruction as a supplement to the regular teaching methodology, and other two projects utilized computer assistance in pupil accounting, guidance services and personnel recording. The small number of projects involving computer technology confirms the fallacious nature of some early estimates that said the bulk of PACE resources was going into hardware.

Seven projects used various media as integral parts of the project design and operation. Two were instructional television (ITV) projects: one used rural and local artifacts in a museum setting as a part of ITV teaching, and the other used ITV to present various cultural enrichment programs. Video tapes and other materials were used in one project, and two projects constructed models to demonstrate new programs to students and teachers. Another project planned to develop a system for classification, location and retrieval of specific instructional materials.

For the operational projects, program development in such areas as team teaching and organization of non-graded schools, etc., was evident in 23 out of the 43 projects. Twenty-one of the 23 were appraised as being consistent with the proposal, and two were rated as offering potentially significant contributions to their field.

Pupil Relations

Twenty programs stressed pupil relations, referring primarily to programs that directly involved pupils. Ten of these programs appeared to flow logically from the project, and five projects were judged significant in terms of potential contributions. Five of the 20 were appraised as "ordinary."

Operational programs featuring pupil relations were scarce, as was the case with this category for planning reports. For the

operational grants, eight out of 43 projects were directly designed to further the relations between the school and the pupils outside the regular curriculum. Two of the eight were judged to flow directly and logically from the program, but six were appraised as making claims that were "trite or insignificant."

Community Relations

A relatively large number of planning projects—67—claimed accomplishments in community relations. Three claims for accomplishments were judged as "overstated," 13 were classified as "ordinary," and one was considered "insignificant." Twenty-eight projects listed accomplishments in community relations that appeared to flow logically from the stated program, and 22 were appraised as making significant contributions in terms of community relations. Many of the claimed accomplishments, however, are judged as superficial and were primarily "paper" involvements rather than meaningful community participation. Only four projects were judged as including in a significant manner the community, local teachers, and the pupils.

Thirty-five operational projects claimed they had achieved acceptable community relations in the areas where their projects functioned; however, the review team concluded that the claims made by the projects were only "trite or insignificant" in 23 out of the 35 cases, and did not possess a great deal of innovative ingenuity. Nine others

were evaluated as being only "ordinary," while only three were credited with having promising contributions toward better community relations

In-service Programs for Teachers

Sixty-six terminal planning project reports included in-service training activities for teachers, administrators, and/or staff members. Accomplishments in 16 of the 66 projects were appraised as being "ordinary;" three were "overstated;" 25 programs seemed to flow logically from the projects; and 22 achieved significant results in terms of possible transfer.

Four projects concentrated on a variety of in-service training programs for teachers and other professional school personnel. These projects included retraining of teachers by outside "experts" as well as instruction by co-workers who had taken special courses. In several instances, teachers were included in the planning stages through conferences and discussion groups. In a few cases special emphasis was given to training teachers prior to major curriculum changes.

The frequent inclusion of in-service education in planning projects as well as the appearance of four projects that were concentrating on this area is encouraging. Too few projects, however, extensively involved local teachers in strategies related to planning, dissemination, and implementation of an innovation.

The appraisal team found that 26 operational projects apparently provided for some type of in-service training. Of this number, 11 programs were rated as flowing naturally from the program structure, and six were judged capable of making significant contributions to in-service education. The claims of nine projects, however, were discredited and their accomplishments were judged "trite or ordinary." As judged from the reports, not a great deal in the way of in-service education was accomplished.

Demonstration

Twenty-three planning projects featured provisions for demonstrating programs, such as team teaching and others. Of this number, eight claims for accomplishment were appraised as "ordinary," seven flowed logically from the program, and eight were appraised as offering significant contributions.

Nine operational projects described programs demonstrating innovations, such as team teaching. Of this number, the reviewers concluded that four flowed logically from the program or were an integral part of the projects, four appeared capable of making significant contributions, and one was judged to be "trite or insignificant."

Dissemination

In all, 153 accomplishments in dissemination were claimed, which

indicates that some projects used more than one method of dissemination.

Accomplishments of three projects out of 94 were judged as "overstated," 55 of the claims were classified as "ordinary," and eight were judged to be "trite or insignficant." Fifty-four were judged to flow logically from the project program, and 27 were rated significant in terms of potential contributions. One program's claim of accomplishment was judged to come from a source that did not seem related to the program.

All 43 terminated operational projects said that efforts were made to disseminate the information about their project. While a rather wide assortment of dissemination strategies were employed, in only 12 situations did the procedures seem to flow logically from the program, and only nine projects presented accomplishments that appeared likely to produce significant contributions. Nineteen projects laid claims to dissemination that were judged to be "ordinary," and claimed accomplishments of three projects were judged as "trite or insignificant." The review team discredited the effectiveness of almost 50 percent of the claimed dissemination efforts, and they believed that less than 20 percent of the claimed accomplishments were significant or potentially promising.

Implementation

Sixty projects out of the 94 planning grants were rated on the extent of implementation achieved by the project. The appraisal team judged claims for success in implementation were "overstated" by one project, "ordinary" for ten others, and "trite or insignificant" in four projects. In the case of 24 other projects, implementation seemed to flow logically from the program, and in 21 projects implementation of accomplishments was rated as significant.

Eighteen of the operational projects indicated that plans for implementation had been built into their projects. After evaluation, the review team judged that six out of the 18 projects had plans for implementation that likely were successful. Three of the projects' implementation plans were judged to flow logically from the program itself; however, eight other plans were judged as being "ordinary," while one was considered "trite or insignificant." Fifty percent of the plans for implementation given by the projects were judged as capable of success, and another 50 percent were of such poor quality that failure seemed assured.

Provisions for Continuation

For planning projects

Fifty-nine out of the 94 grantees indicated they have given some consideration to grant continuation and support by means other than

ESEA Title III funds, and 35 projects indicated that no consideration had been given for grant continuation.

Of those wanting to continue, 30 projects appeared likely to succeed in this respect. Fifteen other projects planning or wanting to continue were judged as unlikely to succeed. Five projects submitted quite sketchy plans for continuation, and in six instances, the plans were too nebulous to be appraised by the analysts. Three projects failed to respond in this category.

For operational projects

A rather large number—33 out of the 43—indicated that specific plans had been, or were being made, for project continuation after termination of funds. Seven projects indicated that they had formulated no plans for continuation, and three projects made no response.

In rating continuation likelihood, 12 of the 33 projects that had plans seemed likely to make it. Eleven presented continuation plans that were judged as questionable, five had plans that were at best "quite sketchy," and ten projects had plans that were too nebulous to appraise or evaluate. From this analysis, probably 12 to 15 projects, at best, will continue, through local efforts and funding, either in part or in toto.

The following table summarizes the provisions for continuation:

Question		Planning	Operational	Total
Does the project give at least some consideration to continuation by means other than support by ESEA Title III?	Yes	59	33	92
	No	35	7	42
	No response	--	3	3
Totals		94	43	137
If yes, are these considerations (plans)				
a. well planned and likely to succeed		30	12	42
b. questionable		15	6	21
c. quite sketchy		5	5	10
d. too nebulous to appraise		6	10	10
e. no response		3	0	3
Totals		59	33	92

EVALUATION PROCEDURES

The first guidelines did not give evaluation the attention that was the case in later editions, yet some mention was made of it and some expectations for evaluation were evident.

This section covers these items:

Types of evaluative procedures used
Relationship between evaluation and overall project
Cost of evaluation
Adequacy of evaluation procedures

Types of Evaluative Procedures Used

For planning grants

Thirty-two projects stated that surveys (questionnaires) were the key evaluative methods used. Only four projects indicated that research design procedures figured in the evaluative techniques, and four other projects used pre- and post-tests. Fifteen grantees listed interviews as the main evaluative procedure, one listed opinions, four listed outside consultants, one conferences, two listed time studies, and one statistical analysis. But 45 projects gave no evidence or failed to respond to this question.

For operational grants

The survey or questionnaire technique reportedly was used by

17 projects, and 16 projects used pre- and post-test evaluative procedures. Nine used interviews, two opinion surveys or polls, and four used as the methodology and instrument for evaluation the official terminal reporting form required of ending Title III Grants.

The following table summarizes the findings on types of evaluative procedures used:

Type of procedure*/	Planning	Operational	Total
a. survey (questionnaire)	32	17	49
b. interview	15	9	24
c. research design	4	4	8
d. pre-test, post-test	4	16	20
e. outside evaluators	4	0	4
f. time studies	2	0	2
g. opinion	1	2	3
h. conferences	1	0	1
i. statistical analysis	1	0	1
j. no response or not indicated	45	0	45
Totals	109	48	157

Relationship Between Evaluation and Overall Project

For planning grants

Eighteen projects were judged as having evaluation integrally related to the overall project; and 20 had evaluation as only a part, or slightly related, to the overall project. Thirty-seven projects had no particular relationship between the evaluation and the overall project,

---

*/ Some projects used more than one evaluative procedure thereby accounting for the numbers in the above table exceeding the total number of projects in the sample.

and one case evaluation was forced to meet the overall characteristics and nature of the project. Eighteen projects failed to respond or indicate any relationship between evaluation and the overall project.

For operational grants

Twelve of the 43 operational projects included evaluation as an integral part of their projects, and 14 projects had some provisions for evaluation as a part of their overall project planning. Another 14, however, were appraised as having no evident relationship between evaluative procedures used and the overall project. In one project, the evaluation had been forced to correspond to the project's characteristics, and two projects made no response in this area or had such poor provisions for evaluation that they were incapable of being analyzed.

The following table summarizes the relationships between evaluation and the overall project:

Type of relationship	Planning	Operational	Total
a. Not any particular relationship, or very casual	37	14	51
b. A part	20	14	34
c. An integral part	18	12	30
d. Evaluation appears forced to need the guidelines requirement	1	1	2
e. No response	18	2	20
Totals	94	43	137

Cost of Evaluation

So few of the 137 planning and operational projects listed expenditures for evaluation that any statistical summary is meaningless. This omission emphasizes once again the lack of concern and understanding of the importance of evaluation. The failure to formulate plans for evaluation is a major characteristic of a large majority of the reports, and this matter is considered in the recommendations.

Adequacy of Evaluation Procedures

For planning projects

Only 30 of the 94 projects were judged as having adequate evaluation procedures in the project design. This may be contrasted to 31 projects which gave no evidence whatsoever of evaluation procedures. Eleven projects indicated some provisions for evaluation, and eight gave a little evidence of evaluative considerations. Fourteen projects failed to respond to this category. Of the 94 projects, 49 gave indications of planning for evaluation ranging from little to much; 45 gave no indication of evaluation, or they failed to respond in this area.

For operational projects

Only five of the 43 operational projects presented adequate evaluative procedures in their project designs. Another 20 projects presented some evidence that efforts or provisions for evaluation had been considered. Ten projects were judged as giving scant attention

or paying "lip service" to evaluation, and six others gave no evidence of provisions for evaluation. Two projects made no response in this area.

A little over eight percent of the projects had made plans and provisions that promised to be adequate for evaluation of their projects; about 70 percent (or 30) had done a little, and about 13 percent had not bothered with evaluation at all.

The following table summarizes the adequacy of evaluative procedures:

Degree of adequacy	Planning	Operational	Total
a. much	30	5	35
b. some	11	20	31
c. little	8	10	18
d. no evidence	31	6	37
e. no response or not indicated	14	2	16
Totals	94	43	137

MAJOR PROBLEMS

The study team judged each project in terms of this question: 'From your study of the report, what were two or three major problems that seemed to be implicit or explicit?

For planning projects

Some 20 individual problems were identified, and two major problems were: (1) financing the project, mentioned 12 times, with the primary concern being that of finding additional funds for project continuation; and (2) problems associated with public relations, listed 10 times, which included matters such as bringing about public awareness of the projects and their intended accomplishments.

Five other problems were identified, although mentioned less frequently but were still considered important. These were: (1) failure to formulate clear objectives, listed eight times; (2) lack of planning, listed seven times; (3) lack of qualified personnel, also listed seven times; (4) problems related to implementation, mentioned six times; and (5) lack of official cooperation from the schools, also mentioned six times.

Of the 13 other problems that were gleaned from the 94 reports, only one occurred as many as three times, while four were mentioned two times, and eight were listed only one time each.

Twenty-nine projects, or about 30 percent, were judged as having no major or minor problems, and 11 projects were so vague or contained so little information that no problems could be identified.

For operational projects

Again, the problem of grant continuation led all others in frequency, with 13 projects giving it a major status. In all, 15 problems were identified. Next was the problem of maintaining and increasing student interest, which was mentioned five times. The following problems were listed four times each: (1) public relations or selling the public and schools on the project, (2) the problem of overextension or attempting to do too much with their limited resources, and (3) the problem of overspending.

Several projects felt that they were in danger of exhausting their budgets. Lack of adequate planning was listed as a major problem in three instances. Four other problems were listed two times each, and five additional problems each were listed once.

Only four projects were judged as having no major problems, and four other projects did not contain sufficient information to ascertain if they did or did not have problems.

The following table summarizes the major problems found in the 137 projects:

Problem	Planning	Operational	Total
a. Grant continuation	12	13	25
b. Public relations	10	4	14
c. Failure to formulate clear objectives	8	0	8
d. Lack of planning	7	3	10
e. Lack of qualified personnel	7	2	9
f. Implementation	6	2	8
g. Evaluation	3	0	3
h. Poor facilities	2	0	2
i. Student interest	2	5	7
j. Overextension of effort	1	4	5
k. Dissemination	1	0	1
l. District cooperation	1	0	1
m. Inadequate leadership	1	2	3
n. Overspending	0	4	4
Totals	61	39	100

OVERALL APPRAISAL

This overall appraisal by the study team was based upon several approaches. The appraisal included a composite summary of the checklist instrument as well as a complete introspective analysis of each project. Included as criteria to be rated were such items as completeness planning, identification of objectives and methodology, involvement of local persons as well as outside consultants, provisions for continuation, and probable overall success of the project.

For planning projects

The study team made an overall appraisal of the project, as gleaned from the report. Fourteen were rated as outstanding, 37 as good, 19 average, 18 poor, and 6 very poor. Thus, 51 (or 54.2%) of the 94 were rated either outstanding or good. Nineteen (or 21%) of the projects ranked average, and 24 or 25 percent were judged as poor or very poor.

For operational projects

In final appraisal of the 43 projects, five projects were rated as outstanding, and 20 were judged as good. Thus, a total of 25 projects were considered outstanding or good. (Since all of the above grants were terminated, the evaluators did not include such items as failure to plan for continuation or provisions for adequate evaluations

as increments in their evaluation.) The major concerns were identifying program objectives and how well these were accomplished. Of course, the apparent contributions and changes in the schools and the students as a result of the Title III project were also important considerations.

The following table summarizes the final appraisal of the 137 projects:

Rating	Planning	Operational	Total
a. outstanding	14	5	19
b. good	37	20	57
c. average	19	11	30
d. poor	18	7	25
e. very poor	6	0	6
Totals	94	43	137

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based upon this study, the following recommendations for future action are suggested:

I. EVERY PROJECT PROPOSAL SHOULD BE REQUIRED TO SUBMIT EVIDENCE THAT THOSE DEVELOPING THE PROJECT HAVE A GOOD GRASP OF THE LOCAL AREA, BOTH IN TERMS OF NEEDS AND RESOURCES.

This evidence does not have to be a needs assessment study if the project is a single idea or a program; still, some evidence of local considerations should be evident.

II. EVERY PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTARY CENTER TYPE OF PACE PROGRAM SHOULD INCLUDE A REASONABLY THOROUGH NEEDS ASSESSMENT STUDY.

A statement or assessment of needs should include the identification of goals, processes for goal attainment, and specification of areas of greatest needs and deficiencies. Most terminal reports included little or nothing about how issues or programs were selected, and, in many other instances, this essential aspect of the report covering the supplementary center type of project was either minimized or omitted.

III. STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION NEED TO GIVE CAREFUL CONSIDERATION TO THE TYPE OF TERMINAL REPORTS THAT WILL PROVIDE A FITTING CLIMAX TO A PACE PROJECT, WILL MEET LEGAL REQUIREMENTS OF REPORTING, AND WILL ALLOW ESSENTIAL FINDINGS TO BE DISSEMINATED EFFECTIVELY.

Our study found that most projects omitted one or more types of information, such as: project title, type of project, grant number, period of time, amount of the grant, number of students to be served, cost per student, number of school districts involved, the name of the state, and so forth.

The study team had no idea how sloppy, inaccurate, and incomplete it would find the final reports, in most cases. Those who submit such reports are guilty of professional negligence and fiscal irresponsibility, and they need to be dealt with accordingly. If this message seems overstated, one needs only to examine the end of project reports submitted by many projects.

IV. INVOLVEMENT OF COMMUNITY RESOURCES AND PERSONNEL SHOULD BE MORE CAREFULLY CONSIDERED; IT SHOULD BE REALISTIC AND SHOULD HAVE ADEQUATE FOLLOW-THROUGH.

No promises should be made that cannot be kept; no obligations should be incurred that cannot be met.

A majority of the projects studied are guilty of overextension and superficiality on community relations. The project developers promise too much, involve too many, and analyze too little the HOW of effective community involvement.

V. ALL PROJECTS SHOULD HAVE EFFECTIVE EVALUATION PROCEDURES—EFFECTIVE IN TERMS OF STATED OBJECTIVES AND PLANNED PROGRAMS.

The call for better evaluation is an old saw, if the three years of PACE history is old, but the call needs to be made again and again.

In only one or two instances out of 94 planning projects can one glean from the proposal a serious and sophisticated concern about evaluation—a concern that viewed evaluation as a vital part of the day-to-day monitoring process as well as a judgmental decision reflecting success or failure of the program.

VI. EVERY PACE PROPOSAL SHOULD HAVE A SEPARATE BUDGET ITEM FOR EVALUATION, AND THIS FIGURE SHOULD NOT BE LESS THAN FIVE PERCENT OF THE TOTAL BUDGET.

Only a small number of the terminated projects included plans for evaluation, and even these appeared to be afterthoughts or were non-integral parts of the project structure. While there is reason to believe that evaluation has improved during the last year, the

level is still far below what is desirable and what is needed.

VII. MORE EVIDENCE OF PLANNING SHOULD BE REQUIRED IN FUTURE PACE PROPOSALS.

The study team was aware of the dilemma between over-planning and over-structuring on the one hand, and a relaxed, pragmatic approach to design on the other, but evidence gained from the 137 terminal reports lead us to believe that greater emphasis should be placed on planning and design in all future proposals.

VIII. PROVISIONS FOR CONTINUATION AFTER TERMINATION OF ESEA TITLE III FUNDING SHOULD BECOME MORE EVIDENT IN THE FUTURE.

The newness of PACE, the unexplored parameters of its guidelines, and the unknown labyrinths of federal assistance have all mitigated against serious consideration of what might take place when the planning grant ended. But as we look ahead, profiting from the past, continuation considerations should become more important without becoming a requirement for approval.

IX. FUTURE PACE PLANNING GRANTS SHOULD BE ALLOCATED ON A SHARING BASIS WITH LOCAL COMMUNITIES—SOMETHING IN THE DOLLAR RANGE OF 8 OR 10 TO ONE.

The study team found that where local funds were committed to the project, it was better planned, the objectives more clearly stated, and the procedures for realizing the major goals of the

project more adequately outlined. Furthermore, the study team believed that a local share of the project expenses—even if small—enhanced prospects of local continuation after termination of federal money. Also, dissemination and implementation are expedited by a sharing basis, and a more receptive climate is created for continuation.

APPENDIX A

APPENDIX A

EVALUATION INSTRUMENT

Analysis of

Terminated ESEA Title III Operational Programs

A. Project Characteristics

1. Grant number_____

2. Period of project_____

3. Total amount of grant_____ _____

4. Total Non-Federal support_____

5. Total Federal support under Title III_____

6. Total Federal support other than Title III_____

7. Major description of project (check one only)

_____ a. Innovative

_____ b. Exemplary

_____ c. Adaptive

8. Types of activity (check one or more)

_____ a. Planning of program

_____ b. Planning of construction

_____ c. Conducting pilot activities

___ d. Operation of program

_____ e. Constructing

_____ f. Remodeling

9. Project title (5 words or less)_____

_____

10. State of applicant_____

11. Scope of project (check one only)

_____ a. National

_____ b. Regional (multi-state)

_____ c. One state

_____ d. One district

_____ e. Multi-district; meaning two to six districts

_____ f. Multi-district (or county); meaning seven or more districts within one state

_____ g. A few schools within one district

_____ h. One school

12. Area served by project (best fit one)

a. Urban

_____ (1) central city

_____ (2) urban fringe

b. Other urban (suburban)

_____ (1) cities of 10,000 or more

_____ (2) cities of 2,500 to 10,000

c. Rural

_____ (1) places of 1,000 to 2,500

_____ (2) other rural

13. Type of activity (check only one)

_____ a. Mostly services to several local school districts, such as administration, dissemination, planning, and developing.

_____ b. Mostly instruction or services to pupils, such as arts, sciences, social studies, mobile demonstrations, museum visits, ETV, outdoor camping, and guidance and counseling.

_____ c. Mostly services to teachers and principals—services such as instructional materials, audio-visual, demonstrations, and in-service training.

_____ d. Mostly planning, such as surveying needs, designing new programs, and visiting innovations.

_____ e. Mostly installation of one or two innovations in one or two schools—innovations such as ITA, computer-assisted instruction, teaching aides, parent involvement, job placement, and new courses.

14. Project classification

_____ a. Focusing upon a single idea or program.

_____ b. Serving as a supplementary education center with several activities.

15. School enrollment, etc. (Section C in guidelines)

G SCHOOL ENROLLMENT AND PROJECT PARTICIPATION DATA

		PRE-KINDER.	KINDER.	1-6	7-12	ADULT	OTHER	TOTALS	4. STAFF MEMBERS ENGAGED IN IN-SERVICE TRAINING FOR PROJECT
1. SCHOOL ENROLLMENT IN GEOGRAPHIC AREA SERVED	(a) PUBLIC								
	(b) NON-PUBLIC								
2. PERSONS SERVED BY PROJECT	(a) PUBLIC								
	(b) NON-PUBLIC								
	(c) NOT ENROLLED								
3. ADDITIONAL PERSONS NEEDING SERVICE	(a) PUBLIC								
	(b) NON-PUBLIC								
	(c) NOT ENROLLED								

H TOTAL NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS BY TYPE (APPLICABLE TO FIGURES GIVEN IN G-2 ABOVE)

WHITE	NEGRO	AMERICAN INDIAN	OTHER NON-WHITE	TOTAL

16. Number of persons served and estimated cost distribution (Section E in guidelines)

B. Project Accomplishments (What do the authors contend was achieved? What appraisal of this is made by reviewer?,

1. Research

Accomplishment	Appraisal
1.	
2.	
3.	
4.	

2. Product development (such as new program for social studies, new materials for handicapped)

Accomplishment	Appraisal
1.	
2.	
3.	
4.	

L NUMBER OF PERSONS SERVED OR TO BE SERVED AND ESTIMATED COST DISTRIBUTION

MAJOR PROGRAM OR SERVICES	TOTAL NUMBER SERVED OR TO BE SERVED						NON-PUBLIC SCHOOL PUPILS INCLUDED (7)	ESTIMATED COST ($)
	PRE-K (1)	K (2)	1-6 (3)	7-12 (4)	ADULT (5)	OTHER (6)		
EVALUATIVE PROGRAMS								
(a) DEFICIENCY SURVEY (AREA NEEDS)								
(b) CURRICULUM REQUIREMENTS STUDY (INCLUDING PLANNING FOR FUTURE NEED)								
(c) RESOURCE AVAILABILITY AND UTILIZATION STUDIES								
INSTRUCTION AND/OR ENRICHMENT								
(d) ARTS (MUSIC, THEATER, GRAPHICS, ETC)								
(e) FOREIGN LANGUAGES								
(f) LANGUAGE ARTS (ENGLISH IMPROVEMENT								
(g) REMEDIAL READING								
(h) MATHEMATICS								
(i) SCIENCE								
(j) SOCIAL STUDIES/HUMANITIES								
(k) PHYSICAL FITNESS/RECREATION								
(l) VOCATIONAL/INDUSTRIAL ARTS								
(m) SPECIAL - PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED								
(n) SPECIAL - MENTALLY RETARDED								
(o) SPECIAL - DISTURBED (INCL DELINQUENT)								
(p) SPECIAL - DROPOUT								
(q) SPECIAL - MINORITY GROUPS								
INSTRUCTION ADDENDA								
(r) EDUCATIONAL TV/RADIO								
(s) AUDIO-VISUAL AIDS								
(t) DEMONSTRATION/LEARNING CENTERS								
(u) LIBRARY FACILITIES								
(v) MATERIAL AND/OR SERVICE CENTERS								
(w) DATA PROCESSING								
PERSONAL SERVICES								
(x) MEDICAL/DENTAL								
(y) SOCIAL/PSYCHOLOGICAL								
OTHER								

3. Skill development (such as reading, mathematics, vocational)

Accomplishment	Appraisal
1.	
2.	
3.	
4.	

4. Process development (such as inquiry training)

Accomplishment	Appraisal
1.	
2.	
3.	
4.	

5. Program development (such as nongraded school, team teaching)

Accomplishment	Appraisal
1.	
2.	
3.	
4.	

6. Pupil relations (such as guidance and counseling)

Accomplishment	Appraisal
1.	
2.	
3.	
4.	

7. Community relations (as fostered by project)

Accomplishment	Appraisal
1.	
2.	
3.	
4.	

8. In-service programs for teachers and/or administrators

Accomplishment	Appraisal
1.	
2.	
3.	
4.	

9. Demonstration (of a program, such as team teaching)

Accomplishment	Appraisal
1.	
2.	
3.	

10. Dissemination (spreading "the word" to others)

Accomplishment	Appraisal
1.	
2.	
3.	
4.	

11. Implementation

Accomplishment	Appraisal
1.	
2.	
3.	
4.	

C. Provisions for Continuation

_____ 1. (yes or no) Does the project give at least some consideration to continuation by means other than support by ESEA Title III.

_____ 2. If yes, are these considerations--

_____ a. well planned and likely to succeed

_____ b. questionable

_____ c. quite sketchy

_____ d. too nebulous to appraise

D. Design of Project as Evidenced from Report

_____ 1. Degree to which evaluation procedures are related to the objectives

a. (much), b. (some), c. (little), d. (no evidence of relationship)

2. What evaluative procedures are used? (research design; pre-test, post-test, survey, interview, etc.)

_____

3. Estimated cost of evaluation_____

4. What relationship does evaluation appear to have in terms of the overall project?

_____ a. An integral part

_____ b. A part

_____ c. Not any particular relationship, or very casual

_____ d. Evaluation appears forced to need the guidelines requirement

E. Final Appraisal

1. What one or two ideas, programs, etc., do you consider significant and worthy of widespread dissemination?

2. From your study of the report, what were two or three major problems that seemed to be implicit or explicit?

3. What is your overall appraisal of the project as gleaned from the report?

_____ a. outstanding

_____ b. good

_____ c. average

_____ d. poor

_____ e. very poor

Addendum for Terminated Planning Grants

Planning projects will focus on (1) an extensive needs assessment, or (2) upon the development of a particular idea or program.

1. Needs assessment

_____ a. (yes or no) Did the planning grant include a needs assessment study?

b. If answer is "yes," then respond to the following items:

1. Which of these data were used in the assessment? (check appropriate ones)

(a) Community factors

_____ (i) Rural-urban composition
_____ (ii) Median family income
_____ (iii) Median grade attained
_____ (iv) Socio-economic class structure
_____ (v) Employment patterns
_____ (vi) Horizontal mobility
_____ (vii) Per pupil expenditure
_____ (viii) Attitudinal considerations
_____ (ix) Other_____
_____
_____

(b) School factors

_____ (i) Student achievement measures
_____ (ii) Socio-economic class structure of school system
_____ (iii) Composition of student body
_____ (iv) Other_____
_____
_____

2. What procedures were employed to determine needs? (check appropriate ones and write in others)

_____ (a) Questionnaire
_____ (b) Interview
_____ (c) Discussion groups
_____ (d) Study groups
_____ (e) Research design
_____ (f) Other_____
_____

3. Who determined the needs?

_____ (a) Members of present staff
_____ (b) New personnel
_____ (c) Special study team
_____ (d) "Outside" consultants
_____ (e) Other_____
_____

4. Is systematic planning in evidence?

_____ (a) Yes
_____ (b) No
_____ (c) Yes and no
_____ (d) Cannot tell

5. Are any planning procedures used, such as:

_____ (a) system analysis
_____ (b) PERT
_____ (c) Critical Path Method
_____ (d) sequences or phases

6. Are evaluation procedures built into the planning procedures? yes_____ no_____

2. Development of a particular idea or program

a. Can you perceive what the project has in mind?

_____ (1) yes, clearly
_____ (2) yes
_____ (3) somewhat
_____ (4) little clarity
_____ (5) for all practical purposes, I cannot perceive this from the report.

b. Has the report presented the idea or program in a concise and understandable manner?

_____ (1) yes, clearly
_____ (2) yes
_____ (3) somewhat
_____ (4) little clarity
_____ (5) for all practical purposes, the presentation shall be classified as imprecise and confusing.

The purpose of a planning grant is to develop a proposal that can be turned into an operational grant. In about 75 percent of the cases this has happened.

3. Based upon this report, what kind of a picture do you have about the next stage—the operational grant?

_____ (a) clear picture
_____ (b) some clarity
_____ (c) uncertain
_____ (d) very little clarity about operational phase
_____ (e) evidently no operational grant is planned