DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 078 511 EA 005 077

AUTHOR	Balyeat, Ralph R.; Norman, C. Douglas
TITLE	ESEA III Evaluation and Dissemination: An Assessment.
PUB DATE	May 73
NOTE	63p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Diffusion; *Evaluation Methods; *Experimental Programs; Federal Aid; *Federal Programs; *Information Dissemination; Pilot Projects; *Program Evaluation; Statistical Analysis
IDENTIFIERS	*Elementary Secondary Education Act Title III; ESEA Title III

ABSTRACT

This study surveyed evaluation and dissemination/diffusion practices of ESEA III projects funded in the 1969 fiscal year, which projects are nearing the end of their operations as federally supported programs. The study attempted to discover if (1) the projects were evaluated in accordance with generally accepted procedures, (2) the project results were widely and effectively disseminated and diffused, (3) there was an association between the degrees to which projects were adequately evaluated and effectively disseminated, and (4) there was an association between the adequacy of projects' evaluation-dissemination components and program continuance at the end of Title III ESEA funding. Two questionnaires were mailed to each of approximately 300 projects listed in an index of programs approved in fiscal year 1969. One instrument sought information about process and product evaluation activities and the other about dissemination and diffusion. The report analyzes the returns, draws conclusions, and makes recommendations. (Author/JF)

ESEA III EVALUATION AND DISSEMINATION: AN ASSESSMENT

by

Ralph R. Balyeat, Ed.D.
Director, Nashville Urban Observatory
Nashville, Tennessee

C. Douglas Norman, Ed.D.
Director, Upper Cumberland Reading Project
Title III, ESEA, Baxter, Tennessee

May, 1973

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

SECTION I

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act was a national effort to promote innovation and change in education. Evaluation of innovative programs and dissemination of information about them to other school systems were considered essential aspects of the Title III ESEA concept. Projects were funded on a short-term basis, usually for three years. Although they could demonstrate exemplary practices, Title III ESEA projects often were considered experimental in nature. During the projects' short life span, their new approaches to education were to be evaluated thoroughly. If found effective, they were to be spread to other school systems through dissemination of information and diffusion of activities.

An assumption underlying Title III ESEA was that if educators were made aware of new and worthwhile programs, they would hasten to adopt them. Title III envisioned a series of supplementary centers throughout the country, in which new practices would be demonstrated to visiting educators, who would be convinced of the innovations' effectiveness through a review of evaluation data and an observation of ongoing activities and who would return to their home school systems to implement the new practices. Title III ESEA was to be the "cutting edge of change" in American education, shortening the time between the development of new practices by research specialists and adoption of these practices by teachers and administrators in the field. Those who became involved in ESEA III projects were faced with demands for evaluation

and dissemination of new programs which at the time had little precedent in American education.

Purpose of the Study

This study was designed to describe the evaluation and dissemination programs of operational projects funded under Title III ESEA and to seek answers to four major questions:

1. Were the projects being evaluated in accordance with generally accepted procedures?
2. Were evaluation results being widely and effectively disseminated and diffused?
3. Was there an association between the degree to which projects were adequately evaluated and effectively disseminated?
4. Was there an association between the adequacy of projects' evaluation-dissemination components and program continuance at the end of Title III ESEA funding?

The study generally sought to determine if Title III ESEA were functioning as originally intended. If projects were effectively evaluated, if information about them were disseminated to a variety of publics through a number of communication media, and if ESEA III personnel assisted other educators on an individual basis in implementing the innovative practices being demonstrated, were these projects more likely to be continued after the phaseout of federal support than projects which were judged to have inadequate evaluation and dissemination programs? Did effective evaluation and dissemination help Title III ESEA achieve its goal of promoting beneficial change in American education?

Sample

Selected for study were the approximately 300 ESEA projects listed in a 1969 index as compiled by the U. S. Office of Education.[1] Projects approved in 1969 ordinarily would be in their final year at the time of the study or recently would have been completed, assuming that all were approved for three years. Each project was mailed two questionnaires, one pertaining to evaluation practices and the other to dissemination/diffusion. The instruments were sent separately, about a month apart, in the summer of 1972. Thirty percent and 50 percent of the dissemination and evaluation questionnaires, respectively, were returned.

In addition to the completed instruments, eight school districts returned blank evaluation questionnaires and six returned blank dissemination questionnaires. These returns were usually accompanied by letters stating that the projects had been terminated and that former staff members were no longer available to provide information. Additional facts on evaluation and dissemination activities were obtained from items returned with completed questionnaires, including project proposals, evaluation reports, and various dissemination materials. A number of questionnaires were returned by projects not listed in the 1969 index. Some programs in that volume apparently had been replaced by others funded through the same fiscal agents. These returns were included in the study.

Groups

Participating projects fell into one or more of the following groups:

1. Evaluation Group, the 131 projects returning completed questionnaires giving information about their evaluation designs and practices.

---

[1]U. S. Office of Education, Pacesetters in Innovation Fiscal Year 1969 (Washington: Government Printing Office, n.d.).

2. Dissemination/Diffusion Group, the 86 projects returning completed dissemination/diffusion questionnaires, sometimes referred to as the Dissemination Group.
3. Common Group, the 42 projects which completed and returned both the evaluation and the dissemination/diffusion questionnaires.
4. Congruent Group, 17 projects which received comparable ratings on the adequacy of both their evaluation and dissemination programs.

Similarity of the four groups was inferred from certain project data. For each group, the median funding level, percentage of completed projects continued and median staff size were as follows:

Group	Funding	Continued	Staff Size
Evaluation Group (N = 131)	$149,500	85.3%	4.6
Dissemination/Diffusion Group (N = 86)	$155,500	80.2%	2.8
Common Group (N = 42)	$143,000	79.3%	3.5
Congruent Group (N = 17)	$142,500	80.0%	4.0

Adequacy Ratings of Evaluation Programs

While numerous approaches could have been used in analyzing the adequacy of evaluation programs of responding projects, it was determined that a simplistic analysis would provide the most valid and reliable classifications. An assumption of the study was that evaluation of operational projects serves two main purposes:

1. Providing periodic feedback to decision makers and documenting the major activities of projects, commonly termed process evaluation, and,
2. Substantiating projects' success or failure, often in terms of meeting performance objectives, and providing information helpful to

those interested in recycling the innovative practices under study, commonly termed product evaluation.

A model providing for process and product evaluation thus was selected as a desirable framework for analysis.

Consideration of product evaluation involved the types of measurement utilized, reliability and validity of instruments, inclusion of a control population or a statistical control, and the statistical design employed. Emphasized were procedures deemed helpful in making decisions about recycling or replicating completed projects.

Adequacy of process evaluation was judged on the basis of systematic efforts by projects to obtain information documenting their major operational activities and identifying needed refinements. Possible data gathering procedures deemed useful included rating scales for various populations, feedback or reaction sheets completed by different groups, conferences between project staff members and participants or others affected by Title III ESEA, formal and informal staff meetings, follow-up visitations, and such techniques as interaction analysis, teachers' diaries, and logs. Five of the 131 projects participating in the evaluation study indicated that they had undertaken either product or process activities not included in a 26-item questionnaire checklist. Based on analysis of data gathered through the survey, each project was assigned to one of the four categories:

Category I, exceptional process and product evaluation.

Category II, acceptable product and process evaluation.

Category III, unacceptable process or product evaluation.

Category IV, unacceptable process and product evaluation.

Categories I and II often were combined and compared with Categories III and

IV, resulting in two basic groupings--those projects with "acceptable" and "unacceptable" evaluation programs.

Assignments of projects to one of the four categories was based on weighted numerical ratings of both process and product activities. In an effort to assess the reliability of these ratings, a university specialist in evaluation was asked to examine each questionnaire and to independently assign projects to one of the four categories. His placements differed from those of the authors on approximately nine percent of the projects. There was no difference, however, in projects assigned to the combined "acceptable" and "unacceptable" categories. There was disagreement only in the degree to which projects were judged to have acceptable or unacceptable evaluation programs.

Percentages of the 42 common projects, the 17 congruent projects and the entire 131 projects participating in the evaluation study which were assigned to each of the four evaluation categories were as follows:

Categories	Congruent Group	Common Group	Evaluation Group
I: Exceptional Process and Product Evaluation	11.8%	19.0%	13.7%
II: Acceptable Product and Process Evaluation	58.8%	45.2%	40.5%
III: Unacceptable Process or Product Evaluation	23.5%	21.4%	28.2%
IV: Unacceptable Process and Product Evaluation	5.9%	14.3%	17.6%

Adequacy Ratings of Dissemination Programs

For this study, "dissemination" was defined as the communicating of information about projects through largely impersonal channels, such as the

mass media, and "diffusion" as working with other educators on a personal basis to help them implement innovative practices demonstrated by Title III ESEA projects. This definition is similar to that used by Guba and others in discussing the distinction between dissemination and diffusion. A weighted numerical rating, similar to that used in the evaluation study, was the basis for judging effectiveness of dissemination/diffusion activities. Projects were rated on the extent to which they employed a multimedia approach to dissemination, the number and kinds of target groups, and the variety of activities providing for interpersonal contact between project personnel and other educators. "Dissemination" sometimes is used in this report to refer to both dissemination and diffusion. When a distinction is made, it is done with the above definitions in mind.

For each project the number of distinct dissemination and diffusion activities was summed. Additional weight then was given to certain activities deemed essential for well-balanced dissemination/diffusion programs. These were 1) providing news releases to the mass media, 2) supplementing print media with materials especially suited to the needs of radio and television, 3) sending information on projects to elected representatives, 4) structured exchanges in which educators could visit project activities, and 5) publication of articles in professional journals.

Categories similar to those used in the evaluation study were established, and each project was assigned to one of the four classifications based on a numerical total derived by summing the number of distinct dissemination and diffusion activities and then adding extra weights for the preceding activities.

Categories were as follows:

Category I, exceptional dissemination and diffusion.

Category II, acceptable dissemination and diffusion.

Category III, unacceptable dissemination or diffusion.

Category IV, unacceptable dissemination and diffusion.

Percentages of the 42 common projects, 17 congruent projects, and the 86 projects responding to the dissemination study which were assigned to each of these categories were as follows:

Categories	Congruent Group	Common Group	Dissemination Group
I: Exceptional Dissemination and Diffusion	11.7	7.1	10.5
II: Acceptable Dissemination and Diffusion	58.8	40.5	40.7
III: Unacceptable Dissemination or Diffusion	23.5	38.1	34.9
IV: Unacceptable Dissemination and Diffusion	5.9	14.3	14.0

Percentages of projects assigned to comparable categories in the evaluation and dissemination studies did not differ significantly. Fifty-four percent of the evaluation group was judged to have at least acceptable evaluation designs, while 51 percent of the dissemination group had at least acceptable dissemination/diffusion programs. A comparison of the adequacy scores of projects responding to the evaluation and/or dissemination questionnaires is given in Table I. As previously noted, projects participating in both studies were designated as the "Common Group."

For each of the three groups of respondents, the table illustrates the percentage of projects assigned to the four categories, (I-Exceptional,

TABLE I

COMPARISON OF COMMON GROUP WITH
TOTAL EVALUATION AND DISSEMINATION RESPONDENT GROUPS

Categories	Percentage Within Category	Median Adequacy Score	Inter-quartile Range
Category I			
Common Group*	19.0	16.5	14.5-18.5
Total Evaluation Group	13.7	15.3	14.0-17.5
Total Dissemination Group	10.5	32.3	31.3-33.4
Category II			
Common Group	45.2	10.8	9.5-13.3
Total Evaluation Group	40.5	11.4	10.2-13.3
Total Dissemination Group	40.7	25.7	22.7-28.7
Category III			
Common Group	21.4	8.0	7.3-10.8
Total Evaluation Group	28.2	8.0	7.5- 9.2
Total Dissemination Group	34.9	16.1	14.0-18.0
Category IV			
Common Group	14.3	4.0	2.5- 5.8
Total Evaluation Group	17.6	4.5	2.5- 6.5
Total Dissemination Group	14.0	8.0	6.0- 9.4

*Percentages given are for Common Group projects with Evaluation and Dissemination programs falling into same rating category.

II-Adequate, III-Partially Adequate, and IV-Inadequate); the median adequacy scores of each group; and the inter-quartile range of the adequacy scores. Although there was a slight intersection in the inter-quartile ranges for Categories II and III in the Common Group, there was not a significant overlap.

Significance of difference between categories for any of the variables examined was determined by use of chi square or a median test. Since frequencies often were small for some of the comparisons within the Common and Congruent Groups, Yate's correction for continuity was used in computing chi square. While a .05 level of significance was accepted as adequate, probabilities greater than .05 also were reported.

SECTION II

FINDINGS OF EVALUATION AND DISSEMINATION SURVEYS

Characteristics of Projects

As noted previously, it was expected that most projects responding to the twin surveys would be in their third operational year or recently would have been completed. This was true with 72 and 60 percent, respectively, of the evaluation and dissemination participants. A number of other projects had ended operations earlier, and staffs had disbanded to the extent that persons knowledgeable about project programs were unavailable to complete questionnaires. Fourteen and 5 percent, respectively, of the projects participating in the dissemination and evaluation studies were in their first year, 12 percent and 5 percent in the second, and 74 and 89 percent in their third year of operations.

Systems Served. Sixty-seven percent of the projects rated as inadequate in dissemination/diffusion served one school district. Seventy percent of the projects rated inadequate in dissemination/diffusion served fewer than 12 systems. On the other hand, 67 percent of those rated exceptional in dissemination/diffusion had service areas of more than 12 districts. The difference in the proportion of projects rated as adequate or inadequate which served more than 12 school systems was significant at the .01 level.

A majority of the projects served only one district. Fifty-five and 52 percent of the respective projects responding to the evaluation and dissemination questionnaires served one school system, 17 and 8 percent served

two through five systems, and 21 and 26 percent served more than 12 systems. None of the dissemination systems served from 6 through 12 systems, although approximately 7 percent of the evaluation participants fell into this category.

Fifty-three and 41 percent, respectively, of systems responding to the evaluation and dissemination questionnaires had fiscal agents with fewer than 12,000 students. Seventy-five percent of the projects rated inadequate in dissemination and diffusion had fiscal agents with fewer than 50,000 students, and 62 percent of the projects rated inadequate in process and product evaluation had fiscal agents with fewer than 12,000 students. The Title III programs with adequate process and product components tended to have fiscal agents with enrollments exceeding 12,000 students (55.2%), whereas projects with inadequate evaluation components were more likely to have fiscal agents with fewer than 12,000 students ($p < .05$).

Audience Served. Eighty-three percent of projects responding to the evaluation survey served a discrete type of audience, i. e., either urban (42%), rural (12%), or small town (29%). The remainder served a combination of audiences with five percent addressed to all three. Projects judged to have acceptable evaluation and dissemination components (Categories I and II) tended to serve urban or small town populations; Category III or IV projects, on the other hand, primarily served rural areas ($p < .02$).

Funding Level. Projects in the Evaluation Group were funded at a median level of $149,500 for the total life (usually three years) of the projects. Of the Evaluation Group projects judged to have acceptable evaluation programs (those falling in Categories I and II), 62 percent were funded above the median level for the entire group. Of those judged to have evaluation designs partially or totally unacceptable, (Categories III and IV),

63 percent were funded below the median for the entire Evaluation Group. There was a similar difference in the Dissemination Group. Sixty-three percent of projects with acceptable dissemination/diffusion programs (I and II) were funded above the median of $155,500 for the entire Dissemination Group. Seventy-one percent of those in Categories III and IV were funded below the median. Difference in median funding levels for projects with acceptable and unacceptable programs was significant at the .01 level in both the Evaluation and Dissemination Groups.

The median funding level for each category in the Evaluation Group was as follows: I - $165,000; II - $185,000; III - $112,000; and IV - $126,000. For the Dissemination Group, the median funding level by category was: I - $172,500; II - $180,000; III - $85,900; and IV - $66,600.

Staff Size. The number of full-time professional staff employed to work on the respondent evaluation and dissemination projects ranged, respectively, from zero to 175 and from zero to 20. Median staff size was 4.6 for the Evaluation Group and 2.8 for the Dissemination Group.

	Percentage Above Median Staff Size			
Group	Category I	Category II	Category III	Category IV
Evaluation Group	42.1	59.6	28.6	35.0
Dissemination Group	62.5	63.2	11.1	40.0

Of the projects categorized, respectively, as acceptable on evaluation and dissemination criteria, 54.9 percent and 62.9 percent had staffs in excess of the median, whereas only 30.9 percent and 35.7 percent of the unacceptable projects had staffs larger than the median number. The difference in the size of staff employed in programs with acceptable evaluation

or dissemination designs, in contrast to those with unacceptable designs, was significant at the .05 level for both the Evaluation and Dissemination Group. In both instances, the projects with the better evaluation or dissemination designs employed a larger number of staff than did those projects with poorly designed evaluation and/or dissemination components.

Projects which received adequate ratings for both their evaluation and dissemination programs tended to be funded at a higher level, have fiscal agent systems enrolling more students, and serve more school systems than those projects with inadequate ratings. Acceptable projects also tended to have larger professional staffs than those with evaluation and dissemination activities rated as unacceptable.

Description of Evaluation Activities

Evaluation programs ranging from sophisticated and complex to almost non-existent were reported by Title III ESEA projects participating in the study. This section will discuss evaluation personnel, techniques and activities, as reported by respondents.

Evaluation Personnel. Projects were primarily evaluated by members of the project staff, persons associated with State Departments of Education, professionals from educational institutions, or some combination of individuals from these groups. Percentages of evaluation programs for which representatives of these various agencies had sole or joint responsibility were as follows:

Agency	Sole Responsibility	Joint Responsibility
State Departments of Education	9.9%	41.2%
Project Staff	17.6%	51.9%
Educational Institutions	29.0%	60.3%

As can be noted, most of the projects were cooperatively evaluated with members of educational institutions especially involved. Ten percent of the projects were jointly evaluated by members from all three agencies. There was no significant difference in the adequacy of evaluation designs based on the affiliation of project evalutors.

Evaluation Techniques. Seventy-two percent of the Title III ESEA projects in the Evaluation Group used locally-made instruments and 65 percent standardized tests to measure changes in psychomotor skills, attitudes, or cognitive growth. Of those projects using standardized tests, 86 percent did so to measure scholastic achievement, 55 percent to assess attitudinal change, and 24 percent to measure change in psychomotor skills. Thirteen percent used standardized tests for all three purposes.

Other kinds of evaluation activities reported and the percentages of projects in the Evaluation Group utilizing those activities were as follows:

1) Statistical analysis to assess test results, 58.0 percent.
2) Judgmental analysis of evaluation data, 55.7 percent.
3) Quasi-experimental evaluation design with control group, 35.1 percent.
4) Single group design serving entire population, 51.1 percent.
5) Pre-post testing design, 74.8 percent.
6) Post testing design only, 11.5 percent.
7) Ratings of program participants by students, 33.6 percent.
8) Ratings of program participants by evaluation specialists, 52.7 percent.
9) Ratings of program participants by teachers or administrators, 40.5 percent.
10) Self-evaluation by persons involved in project, 75.6 percent.
11) Feedback questionnaires from educators served by project, 62.6 percent.
12) Feedback questionnaires from students served by project, 28.2 percent.

13) Feedback questionnaires from parents served by project, 42.0 percent.

14) Conferences with program participants, 71.0 percent.

15) Meetings with project staff to consider formal (written) feedback, 55.7 percent.

16) Meetings with project staff to consider information (spoken) feedback, 71.8 percent.

17) Follow-up meetings with former participants, 22.1 percent.

18) Teachers' diaries, 15.3 percent.

19) Teachers' logs, 26.7 percent.

20) Case studies, 28.2 percent.

21) Students' cumulative records, 28.2 percent.

22) Other not specified above, 3.7 percent.

In addition, 49.1 percent of the projects used systematic observational techniques, such as interaction analysis. Category I and II projects, i. e., those rated as having at least acceptable evaluation designs, placed greater emphasis on the use of such techniques than did projects in Categories III and IV ($p < .05$).

Using a continuum of 1-10 (where 1 represented "not at all," 5 "somewhat," and 10 "completely"), each project was asked to rate certain aspects of its evaluation program. Those aspects rated and the median responses by participating projects were as follows:

1) Evaluation design set forth in the original project proposal was followed to a substantial degree, 7.1. (Twenty percent reported a rating of 5 or less, and 5 percent indicated that they had had to revise totally the evaluation designs as set forth in their original proposals. No change in the original evaluation designs reported by fewer than 7 percent of the responding projects.)

2) The extent to which projects were redirected as a result of process evaluation, 5.1. Sixty-two percent of the replies ranged from "somewhat" to "not at all." Fifteen percent of the projects had not been changed in any way as a result of process evaluation, but three percent had been totally redirected.

3) Analysis of data gathered by means other than standardized instruments, 6.8. Projects with evaluations rated as acceptable placed significantly greater reliance on analyzing such data than did projects in the unacceptable category ($p < .05$).

4) Extent to which project objectives were stated in performance terms, 8.1. There was a significant difference ($p < .01$) between projects judged to have adequate or inadequate evaluation designs. Fifty-five percent in Categories I and II ranked above the median rating, contrasted to 29 percent of those in Categories III and IV. Almost one-third of projects with acceptable evaluation programs indicated that their objectives were completely stated in performance terms, contrasted to fewer than 14 percent of the unacceptable projects.

5) Degree to which projects were evaluated in terms of their objectives, 8.3. There was no significant difference ($p < .05$) in the proportion of acceptable and unacceptable projects (Categories I and II versus Categories III and IV) with ratings higher than the median of 8.3.

6) Extent to which objectives were modified during the course of project operations, 5.0. Although there was no significant difference in the proportion of Category I and II and Category III and IV projects with rating exceeding the median, 25.7 percent of the former indicated extensive (rating $\geq$ 8) modification compared to 8.9 percent of Category III and IV projects.

In addition to these activities, there was a general tendency for acceptable projects to have educational audits by independent agencies. Of the 30.4 percent of Evaluation Group projects with independent audits, 58 percent were in Categories I and II, contrasted to 42 percent in Categories III and IV.

Marginal data on evaluation activities are provided in Appendix A. The data are usually depicted by Category as well as for the total Evaluation Group.

Assistance by State Education Agencies. Primary role of state education agencies (SEA's) in assisting projects with their evaluations was a consultative one. Seventy and eight tenths percent of projects with acceptable evaluation programs (Categories I and II) and 69.1 percent of those with unacceptable programs (Categories III and IV) reported receiving such assistance from SEA's. Twenty-six percent of the projects reported that SEA's were responsible for actually conducting their evaluations, and 13.3 percent indicated that SEA's had assisted in the design of their evaluation components. With respect to each of these services, there was no significant difference between projects judged to have acceptable and unacceptable evaluation designs in regard to the extent of services received from SEA's.

Twenty-eight and 15 percent of unacceptable and acceptable projects, respectively, reported that SEA's assisted with dissemination. Nature of this assistance is unclear; it should be pointed out that with passing of responsibility for many Title III ESEA projects from the U. S. Office of Education to the states, areas of responsibility for dissemination also were established. USOE was to be responsible for national dissemination, SEA's for state-wide dissemination, and individual projects for dissemination

within their service regions. Whether the dissemination assistance reported by projects involved their regional responsibilities, state-wide dissemination of local project results, or both, is unclear. Whether this dissemination dealt with reporting of evaluation results or other information also is not known.

Of the 131 projects in the Evaluation Group, 17.5 percent reported receiving no assistance from their SEA's in the form of consultation, in designing and conducting evaluation programs, and in disseminating information. Whether any of these projects requested SEA assistance was not brought out in the survey. A table depicting assistance received by projects in each category and for the total Evaluation Group is provided in Appendix A.

Description of Dissemination/Diffusion Activities

As with evaluation activities, Title III ESEA projects participating in this study were found to have dissemination/diffusion programs ranging from sophisticated to almost non-existent. As noted earlier, in collecting data a distinction was made between dissemination, which was defined as mainly one-way communications process utilizing the mass media, audio-visual and printed materials, and presentations to large groups; and diffusion, defined as personal assistance from project to other educators who wished to adopt Title III ESEA innovations. In the context of this study, dissemination is viewed as being concerned with the first two steps commonly associated with the change process, making others aware of new practices and creating interest in learning more about innovations. Diffusion is seen as more closely associated with the final three steps in the change process, trial, evaluation and adoption or institutionalization. Research has shown

that persons who adopt new practices most often depend on the mass media for information during the first two steps, but turn to inter-personal communication with persons they know and trust during the final three steps.

Dissemination Personnel. Forty-four percent of persons responsible for dissemination among Title III ESEA projects participating in this study had completed six or more years of college. Thirty percent held Master's degrees and 8 percent four-year degrees. Fifty-five percent of Title III ESEA projects had males as dissemination directors, 24 percent females, and 10 percent had men and women sharing responsibility for dissemination activities.

The type of previous experience most often mentioned by Title III ESEA dissemination personnel was school public relations. This was followed, in order, by the teaching of English and/or journalism, work in advertising agencies, as school publication advisers, and as newspaper writer/editors. Previous mass media experience was most common among dissemination personnel in Category I projects, although in all categories of the Dissemination Group, experience in school public relations and the teaching of English or journalism was more prevalent than that in the newspaper or broadcasting fields.

The type of experience deemed useful for ESEA III dissemination personnel tended to reflect the actual backgrounds of respondents. School public relations was considered most useful, with classroom teaching also highly rated; however, photography, newspaper reporting, and broadcast experience also were judged as good preparation for Title III ESEA dissemination duties.

Dissemination/Diffusion Techniques. Major dissemination/diffusion techniques reported by the 86 projects in the Dissemination Group and the percentages of projects employing them were as follows:

1. News releases for area newspapers, 81 percent, with a range of from 100 percent of projects in Category I (exceptional dissemination and diffusion) to 42 percent in Category IV (inadequate dissemination and diffusion).
2. News releases especially tailored to the special needs of radio and television stations, 20 percent.
3. Newsletters published on a regular basis, 40 percent, with a range from 78 percent of Category I projects to none in Category IV.
4. Articles in professional journals, 32.6 percent, with a range of from 56 percent in Category I to non in Category IV.
5. Slide-tape presentations, 61 percent, including all projects in Category I.
6. Displays of still photographs, bulletin boards, charts and graphs, and other audio-visual aids, more than 40 percent.
7. Visits by Title III personnel to other educators, 86.5 percent.
8. Educational conferences, 86.5 percent.
9. Orientation meetings for school administrators, 77.5 percent.
10. Observations by visiting educators, 76.4 percent.
11. Talks before parent and civic groups, 76.4 percent.
12. Tours of demonstration schools, 57.3 percent.
13. Inservice programs led by Title III personnel, 69.7 percent.
14. Structured teacher exchanges as part of project design, 36 percent, with a range of from 56 percent in Category I to 8 percent in Category IV.

Using a 10-point scale, projects were asked to rate their coverage by the mass media. A rating of one indicated "poor" coverage, 5 "fair" and 10 "excellent." The median rating by all projects was 4.5. By Dissemination Group categories, median ratings were as follows: _ (exceptioanl dissemination and diffusion), 7: II and III, 5: and IV (inadequate dissemination and diffusion), 2.

Fifty-two percent of projects estimated that at least half of their releases were printed by newspapers receiving them. Nine percent indicated that fewer than half were printed, and the remainder had no way to estimate the exten .. usage.

Modal frequency of newsletters was monthly, the most popular size four pages, and the most used method of production offset duplication. Thirteen percent of the projects distributed 1-500 copies of each issue, while the same percentage distributed more than 3,000 copies.

Newsletters and other special publications most frequently were sent to educators within the area served by projects. The second largest target group receiving project materials was educators outside Title III ESEA service areas, followed by interested lay citizens and members of the power structure within a project area. Legislative and Congressional representatives least often were included on project mailing lists.

Marginal data on dissemination and diffusion activities are given in Appendix A. Data often are summarized for the entire Dissemination Group and then broken down according to the four rating categories.

SECTION III

EVALUATION, DISSEMINATION AND PROJECT CONTINUATION

Association Between Evaluation and Dissemination/Diffusion Practices

A strong association between the caliber of evaluation and dissemination/diffusion activities was found in the Title III ESEA project survey, as indicated by the following matrix:

	Dissemination and Diffusion Categories			
Evaluation Categories	Category I	Category II	Category III	Category IV
Category I	4.8%	7.1%	4.8%	2.4%
Category II	2.4%	23.8%	16.7%	2.4%
Category III	0.0%	4.8%	9.5%	7.1%
Category IV	0.0%	4.8%	7.1%	2.4%

The congruence of category placement, i. e., projects receiving comparable ratings on both evaluation and dissemination, was 40.5 percent, as evidenced by the sum of percentages within the solid diagonal lines. Viewing the association from another perspective, 14.4 percent of all projects differed in their category placement by more than one classification. This is denoted by the projects falling outside of the two broken lines. Dichotomizing the two groupings into acceptable (Categories I and II) versus unacceptable (Categories III and IV) indicates that there was a 64.3 percent agreement in placement of projects responding to both dissemination and evaluation questionnaires.

These percentages were sufficiently high to warrant the conclusion that in general the same degree of effort and care was exercised in planning and conducting both evaluation and dissemination/diffusion programs of Title III ESEA projects. In those projects giving considerable attention to adequate process evaluation for assisting decision makers and including valid and reliable product measures for determining project success, parallel attention seemed to be given to developing well-rounded programs for dissemination and diffusion of project activities and outcomes. On the other hand, where little attention was given to developing adequate evaluation programs, there seemed to be a similar lack of emphasis on sound dissemination/diffusion practices.

The association between adequacy of evaluation and effectiveness of dissemination/diffusion was further substantiated by the number of different reporting activities undertaken by Evaluation Group projects. The reporting of evaluation results was considered part of the evaluation survey. It should be noted that some writers refer to this as dissemination of evaluation results. Dissemination in this study, however, was considered in a much broader context. Respondents to the evaluation questionnaire were asked to indicate whether their reporting practices included printed reports, conferences, informal visits by project staff to school systems, and visits and/or observations at Title III centers by area educators. Whereas approximately 68 percent of projects in Evaluation Categories I and II indicated that they relied on three or more of these channels for reporting evaluation results, 33 percent of projects in Categories III and IV employed three or more of the same channels. This difference was significant at the .05 level.

Evaluation and dissemination are vital to projects concerned with the potential exportability of their innovative programs to other school systems. The association between the caliber of these functions, as noted in this study, existed despite the fact that each function requires personnel with somewhat different competence and experience.

Linkage Between Evaluation, Dissemination/Diffusion and Program Continuation

As discussed earlier, Title III ESEA projects are intended to develop innovative educational practices. These are evaluated and, if found effective, are demonstrated to educators and installed in as many interested systems as possible. If the Title III ESEA premise is valid, strong evaluation and dissemination efforts should be a major factor in innovative programs' being continued after the phaseout of federal support. The results of this study indicate that such may not be the case. Of completed projects responding to the surveys of evaluation and dissemination practices, the likelihood of local adoption after the end of ESEA III funds generally increased as one moved from Category I to Category IV, that is, from projects rated exceptional to those rated inadequate in dissemination and evaluation.

Analysis of the Common Group and the total Evaluation Group indicated no significant relationship between projects' ratings on evaluation and dissemination/diffusion and program adoption or continuation by local districts after the end of short-term Title III ESEA funding. Seventy-seven percent of Common Group projects judged to have unacceptable process and/or product evaluation were continued, compared with 83 percent of projects judged to have at least acceptable process and product evaluation. Although there was little difference in these percentages, there was a

significant difference in the degree to which projects with acceptable and unacceptable evaluation programs were continued.

Of the 87 completed projects responding to evaluation survey, 74 were continued in full or in part with local funding. Forty-one percent indicated that parts of their Title III programs had been adopted by local systems, while 35 percent stated that their entire projects had been adopted. Projects with evaluation programs judged to be inadequate tended to be adopted in their entirety, whereas those with evaluations judged to be acceptable were more likely to be continued in part ($p < .05$).

Degree of Continuation	Categories I & II	Categories III & IV
Continued in Part	57.1%	31.4%
Continued in Entirety	28.6%	45.7%
Not Continued	14.3%	22.9%

This finding suggests that systems with poorly-evaluated programs possibly did not have sufficient evidence to distinguish between successful and unsuccessful project components and therefore adoption was an all-or-nothing proposition. When projects did have good evaluation programs, there may have been enough evidence available to permit a more precise selection of components for adoption. A less tenable implication is that project officials who planned and conducted thorough evaluation programs were inclined to be more discerning and critical than officials of Category III and IV projects and therefore more likely to question the effectiveness of project activities.

It also can be conjectured that projects without adequate evaluation designs tended toward subjective self-evaluation and therefore assessed

their outcomes as more successful than did projects with rigorous evaluation programs. Projects in Category III and especially Category IV relied heavily on subjective self-assessment.

Evaluation alone thus seemed to have no significant effect on project continuation. What about adequate evaluation combined with effective dissemination? This linkage goes to the heart of the philosophy of educational change underlying ESEA III. Did Common Group projects participating in both the evaluation and dissemination surveys reported in this study differ from the Evaluation Group? The answer seems to be, "No."

Projects in the Common Group were dichotomized into two subgroups, those judged to have adequate evaluation and dissemination and those with inadequate evaluation and dissemination. The following illustrates the percentage breakdown for the dichotomized subgroups.

	Adequate Evaluation/Dissemination	Inadequate Evaluation/Dissemination
Projects Continued	77.8%	83.3%
Projects Not Continued	21.2%	16.7%

Adequate and inadequate groups were identified by adding the evaluation and dissemination categories in which projects had been placed in the earlier separate ratings. The lowest possible sum which could result was 2, the highest 8. Projects with summed evaluation/dissemination ratings of 2-4 were classified as adequate in both categories, those 5-8 as inadequate. Projects continued, in whole or in part, were included in the "projects continued" category. Chi square was computed for the preceding, but the distribution was not significant.

The same procedure was applied to systems judged to have adequate and inadequate dissemination, and adequate and inadequate diffusion, in an effort to see if dissemination affected chances for continuation more than diffusion or vice-versa. Again there were no findings which were statistically significant. Table 2 on the following page illustrates the data that were used as the basis for the computations.

The only dissemination/diffusion activity which in itself possibly could have affected continuation was structured teacher exchanges. The following table shows the continuation status of projects with and without structured teacher exchanges as part of their diffusion programs. This distribution was significant at the .20 level, using chi square.

	Structured Exchanges	No Structured Exchanges
Projects Continued	93.3%	74.1%
Projects Not Continued	6.7%	25.9%

Other factors--such as the nature of areas served, enrollment of fiscal agents, and levels of funding--which possibly could have affected continuation chances were examined. The only statistically significant association between these factors and continuation involved the number of systems served by a project. The probability that projects serving single systems, as contrasted to multiple systems, would be continued after phase-out of ESEA III funds was significant at the .05 level.

TABLE 2

CONTINUATION STATUS OF PROJECTS
RATED "ADEQUATE" OR "INADEQUATE" IN DISSEMINATION AND DIFFUSION

Continuation Status	Dissemination/Diffusion Ratings			
	Adequate Dissemination	Inadequate Dissemination	Adequate Diffusion	Inadequate Diffusion
Projects Continued	75.0%	86.4%	77.8%	83.3%
Projects Not Continued	25.0%	13.6%	22.2%	16.7%

SECTION IV

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Nature of Study

The purpose of this study was to survey evaluation and dissemination/diffusion practices of ESEA III projects funded in the 1969 fiscal year and presumably nearing the end of their operations as federally supported programs. Answers to four questions were sought:

1. Were the projects evaluated in accordance with generally accepted procedures?
2. Were project results widely and effectively disseminated and diffused?
3. Was there an association between the degree to which projects were adequately evaluated and effectively disseminated?
4. Was there an association between the adequacy of projects' evaluation and dissemination programs and program continuation upon termination of Title III funding?

Two questionnaires were mailed to each of approximately 300 projects listed in an index of programs approved in fiscal year 1969. One instrument sought information about process and product evaluation activities, the other about dissemination and diffusion. Fifty-three percent of the evaluation survey instruments and 30 percent of the dissemination questionnaires were returned.

A numerical rating system was established to judge the adequacy of process and product evaluation of projects participating in that portion

of the study. On the basis of the ratings, projects were assigned to one of four categories:

Category I, exceptional process and product evaluation.

Category II, acceptable process and product evaluation.

Category III, unacceptable process or product evaluation.

Category IV, unacceptable process and product evaluation.

A weighted numerical rating also was established for the dissemination/diffusion activities reported in the 86 completed questionnaires returned in this phase of the study. Each project was placed in one of four categories, similar to those established for the evaluation study:

Category I, exceptional dissemination and diffusion.

Category II, adequate dissemination and diffusion.

Category III, inadequate dissemination or diffusion.

Category IV, inadequate dissemination and diffusion.

For descriptive purposes, the evaluation and dissemination respondents first were considered separately. Then a third group, termed the Common Group, which included the 42 projects that had completed and returned both the evaluation and dissemination questionnaires, was established. For further comparison, a fourth group, designated the Congruent Group, was established. It was made up of the 17 projects which had been placed in corresponding categories as a result of both the evaluation and the dissemination/diffusion ratings. Specific attention was devoted to the Common and Congruent Groups in attempting to answer Questions 3 and 4 posed by this study.

Summary of Findings

Percentage of Evaluation Group projects in each of the four rating categories was as follows: I, 13.7; II, 40.5; III, 28.2; IV, 17.6. For Dissemination Group projects, the percentages were as follows: I, 10.5; II, 40.7; III, 34.9; IV, 14.0.

In general, the study indicated that the same degree of effort and care was exercised in designing both evaluation and dissemination/diffusion programs of Title III ESEA projects. More than 40 percent of projects in the Common Group, those participating in both the evaluation and dissemination surveys, received the same ratings for their evaluation and dissemination components. Forty-five percent of the projects differed in their evaluation and dissemination ratings by only one category, 12 percent by two categories, and only 2 percent by as much as three categories.

A matrix constructed from the evaluation and dissemination ratings of the Common Group revealed that 64.3 percent of the projects fell in the "acceptable" or "unacceptable" quadrants. These quadrants were composed of projects placed in Categories I and II, or Categories III and IV, in both the evaluation and dissemination ratings.

Projects with evaluation designs judged adequate tended to employ a variety of dissemination/diffusion techniques. Projects judged to have inadequate evaluation designs tended to have more restrictive dissemination/diffusion programs.

In designing the study, it was hypothesized that those projects which were evaluated in accordance with generally accepted procedures and which widely and effectively disseminated results of successful innovative programs would be those most likely to be continued by local school districts

after the termination of Title III funding. This hypothesis was not borne out by the findings. There was no significant association discernable between projects judged to have adequate evaluation and/or dissemination programs and project continuation after the end of ESEA III support. Title III did succeed in its goal of providing "seed money" for new programs, since 34 of 42 projects in the Common Group (81 percent) were continued at least in part with local funding. It could not be established however, that there was any link between continuation and the nature of a project's evaluation and dissemination/diffusion programs.

Comparison of those projects with acceptable and unacceptable evaluation and dissemination practices showed that approximately 67 percent of the former and 60 percent of the latter were continued in some form. There was, however, a significant difference in the degree of project continuation between the two groups. School systems tended to incorporate into their local programs only parts of Title III projects which were judged to have acceptable evaluation and dissemination components. On the other hand, systems were far more likely to continue in their entirety Title III projects which were judged to have inadequate evaluation-dissemination.

While the data do not explain this tendency in adoption, it is reasonable to assume that projects with adequate evaluation-dissemination provided evidence which permitted officials to be discerning and critical. It also is possible that project continuation mainly depends on factors not related to ESEA III activities, such as personalities or political expediency.

In general, projects with adequate process and product evaluation and with strategies for the effective dissemination and diffusion of project

outcomes were those which received larger amounts of federal funding and which had larger professional staffs than projects with poorly rated evaluation-dissemination. While these associations could be said to be spurious in that a higher level of funding enabled projects to employ a larger number of staff members competent to develop good evaluation and dissemination programs, the findings emphasized that without adequate funding it is difficult to conduct an effective demonstration program. This fact should be taken into consideration when planning model projects and setting their funding levels.

The more effectively evaluated and disseminated ESEA III projects were those which served the greatest number of systems, had the largest fiscal agents from the standpoint of net enrollment, and focused on non-rural audiences. These findings suggest that greater expertise exists in larger, urban areas. Availability of human resources could be a major factor in developing effective evaluation-dissemination programs.

Conclusions

With reference to the four major questions posed by this study, and based on the data gathered, the following conclusions may be drawn.

A majority of the projects participating in the two surveys were evaluating and/or disseminating their programs in accordance with what were judged to be acceptable practices. This conclusion is based upon the assumptions that accurate and complete information was supplied by responding projects, and that the methods of rating Title III ESEA evaluation and dissemination techniques were valid. It is necessary to qualify this conclusion, however, since 46 percent of projects responding to the evaluation survey and 49 percent of those responding to the dissemination

survey were judged to have programs partly or completely inadequate. It could be argued that in demonstration projects, such as those funded under ESEA III, evaluation and dissemination are very necessary and that many more than half the responding projects should have had acceptable evaluation and dissemination. Even more disturbing was the fact that, among Common Group projects, only 38 percent had at least acceptable (Categories I and II) evaluation and dissemination components. From a more positive perspective, improvement over past findings can be noted. Guba's analysis of 21 Title III ESEA proposals in 1967 showed that most contained no evaluation design at all, and only one was judged to have an exceptional evaluation design.[2] Most of the 131 programs examined in this study did have some type of evaluation design and 13 percent were judged to be as good as the current state of the art will permit.

With respect to the third major question, excellence in the evaluation component seemed to carry over into dissemination, and, vice versa, inadequacy in evaluation accompanied inadequacy in dissemination. Of the projects rated as either adequate or inadequate in evaluation, 64 percent were similarly rated in regard to their dissemination/diffusion practices. Those projects which had strong evaluation programs tended to have strong dissemination components. Those which were weak in one area tended to be weak in the other.

The fourth question concerning association between good evaluation-dissemination and continuation of completed projects was the most difficult

---

[2]Egon G. Guba, "Report on the Evaluation Provisions of Twenty-One Title III Proposals" (report to the National Panel on Title III Evaluation, Richard I. Miller, Director, October 15, 1967.)

to answer. If there were any association, it seems to have been a negative one. Projects with well-regarded evaluation-dissemination seemed to have less chance for continuation than those with weak or almost non-existent evaluation-dissemination. No firm conclusion can be drawn on the basis of data gathered, however, other than that there seems to be no discernable tendency for Title III ESEA projects with highly rated evaluation-dissemination programs to have better chances of being continued after phaseout of Title III funding than for projects with poor evaluation and dissemination.

A subsequent conclusion must be that, at least among the projects surveyed, the usefulness of evaluation and dissemination in promoting beneficial change in education is questionable. Not that Title III ESEA failed to produce change: a large percentage of projects surveyed indicated that they were being continued, or expected to be continued, in whole or in part, through local funding after the end of Title III ESEA support. Whether evaluation and dissemination play the role envisioned for them in promoting change is another matter.

It also should be noted that innovative practices can be adopted by individual educators without a system's making a formal commitment to change and/or without the practices being reflected in local budgets. This is especially true of projects which seek to improve instructional competencies of teachers, but which do not require a substantial expenditure of funds for equipment and special materials in order to effect such change. Since most surveys of Title III ESEA necessarily are directed to fiscal agents (most indexes list only fiscal-agent systems, not other systems benefiting from the projects), it also may be possible that systems within

the region served by a project may adopt certain innovative practices while fiscal agents do not. A truly definitive study of Title III ESEA's effectiveness may not be possible unless mail surveys are followed up with extensive, in-depth personal interviewing and on-site observation.

It also may be possible that the present direction of Title III ESEA may need to be changed. It is the conclusion of the authors, based on the best available evidence, that this is true. Recommendations for re-directing Title III are proposed in the final subsection of this study. In regard to techniques used in evaluation and dissemination programs of responding projects, some specific conclusions can be drawn.

Dissemination. Projects seemed to be oriented toward the print media. This is indicated by the 81 percent of Dissemination Group projects sending releases to local newspapers, while special services for radio and television stations were provided by only 2 to 20 percent of the same projects.

Relations with the mass media, as rated by project personnel, seemed to reflect the quality of dissemination efforts. Ratings were highest among Category I projects, next among those in Categories II and III, and lowest in Category IV, those judged to have inadequate dissemination and diffusion programs.

Interpersonal communications about ESEA III programs seemed to have stressed creating awareness among educators rather than on helping them adopt new practices. This was indicated by the relatively large number of projects utilizing such traditional (for educators) forms of communication as conferences, speeches at inservice meetings, and casual observations, and the comparatively small percentage which had teacher exchanges structured into their designs. It should be noted that the only statistically

significant association which could be found between project continuation and various forms of dissemination/diffusion was related to structured teacher exchanges. Although even this link admittedly was weak, it may be that exportability of innovative practices to other systems depends in part on how much Title III ESEA personnel are willing to "get their hands dirty" in teachers' classrooms, helping them to adapt innovations to their specific needs and problems.

Overall, however, it appeared that the variety and quality of dissemination and diffusion programs carried on by Title III ESEA projects had little effect on the extent to which innovative programs were institutionalized after the end of Title III ESEA support.

Evaluation. Considerable reliance was placed on the use of standardized tests to measure attainment in attitudinal development, psychomotor skills, and/or cognitive growth. In conjunction with standardized tests, many of the projects used locally developed instruments to assess specific types of growth, most of which were in the affective domain. Approximately 18 percent of the projects relied exclusively on locally made instruments; 13 percent used neither locally developed nor standardized instrumentation.

Many of the projects relied solely on subjective judgmental analysis in determining the success of their endeavors. Approximately 40 percent of the projects, including almost half of those using some type of instrumentation, reported that they employed only judgmental analysis of evaluation data. This, plus other evidence, seemed to suggest a possible lack of statistical and design sophistication in many cases. Evaluative data often may have been collected without meaningful analysis. In these instances, it would appear that data were collected without a clear purpose

or without reference to an overall design, and this fact made analysis and interpretation an extremely difficult task.

The large percentage of projects indicating that their objectives were stated in performance terms and the small percentage reporting the use of some type of comparative standard suggests a possible misunderstanding of performance evaluation. The lack of evidence collected to show that effect or outcome was in some way related to activity undertaken was the greatest failing of the evaluation designs. In many project designs, it could be argued that the passage of time or the increased maturity of students could solely account for any changes noted by data collected.

In general, the projects exhibited more thoroughness in process evaluation than in product assessment. They employed numerous and varied mechanisms to obtain information about the evolution of their particular programs. There was extensive use of feedback questionnaires completed by selected audiences and conferences with program participants. Rating forms and staff conferences also were utilized by a majority of those reporting.

The most notable omission was in follow-up studies of former participants. Only 22 percent of the projects indicated having undertaken some type of follow-up activity with former program participants. The relatively low level of importance assigned to this function adversely affected the quality and completeness of both their process and product evaluation components.

Follow-up activities are almost mandated in any program designed to institute change. In working with either the affective or cognitive domain, change invariably occurs gradually over an extended period of time. Without some type of follow-up, meaningful assessment of change becomes highly improbable, if not impossible.

From a broader perspective, a serious question can be raised about the intended utility of the project evaluations. This study illustrates that the quality of the individual project evaluations had little, if any, effect on the extent to which projects were adopted by local educational systems after the termination of Title III support.

Recommendations

At this writing Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, born out of high hopes for changing American education, is threatened with extinction or at least a serious downgrading.

This is as a result of federal budget and revenue sharing proposals. An implied criticism is that Title III ESEA has not been able to prove its effectiveness in achieving its goal of changing American education. While this goal is commendable, it may be that too much has been expected of the multitude of short-term and somewhat under-financed Title III ESEA projects. In a span of usually not more than three years, projects have, in effect, been expected to operate small research and development programs, establish significant new approaches to education, field test them, evaluate their effectiveness, disseminate information about them to other educators and finally help other school systems to institutionalize the new activities.

It may be that this is simply too much to expect, considering the context in which Title III ESEA operates. For example, change research has shown that it takes farmers from four to six years to adopt new agricultural practices after being made aware of them.[3] This is even more significant

---

[3]Agricultural Extension Service, "How Farm People Accept New Ideas," North Central Regional Publication No. 1 (Ames: Iowa State College, 1955).

when it is considered that these are changes which already have been researched, developed and field tested by governmental agencies and commercial firms. It can be assumed that educators will take at least as long to adopt new school practices.

If Title III ESEA therefore wishes to achieve its goal of encouraging improvements in American education, these changes in its emphasis are recommended:

1. A few areas of national need for changes in education should be identified.
2. Educational laboratories, the National Institute of Education and other agencies should develop and successfully field test new programs designed to meet these national needs.
3. Title III ESEA projects should be charged with demonstrating and diffusing these new programs, which already have been developed and proved successful, to school systems in their immediate areas. If needed, the projects will be allowed to make limited refinements in the programs to meet local needs.
4. Title III projects should be funded for five years, so that they will have more time to help educators in the field to adopt the new practices.
5. Evaluation of Title III ESEA should be in terms of its ability to diffuse new practices throughout projects' immediate areas and of the practices' effects on teachers and students.

The scope of Title III ESEA thus would be narrowed. The multitude of small projects, each doing its own thing and sometimes engaging in whatever happens to be the fad in education at the moment, would be given direction

by the national assessment of priority needs in education. The publicizing of project activities, which often is equated with dissemination, would be replaced by a structured program of diffusion activities, with project personnel going out into the schools of their region and working hand-in-hand with the teachers in the classroom to help them adopt new practices which already had been proved effective. Evaluation of Title III ESEA could focus on the effectiveness of diffusion activities and consequently would present a clearer picture than now exists of the ability of Title III ESEA to change American education for the better.

APPENDIX

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE A

DEGREE TO WHICH TITLE III PROGRAMS
INCORPORATED SELECTED EVALUATION TECHNIQUES

Activities	Percent of projects utilizing selected activities: Common Group	Total Group
1. Ratings of program participant's achievement	81.0	71.0
2. Self-evaluation by project participants	81.0	76.3
3. Experimental/control group format	45.2	39.7
4. Utilized locally-made instruments	73.8	71.8
5. Utilized standardized instruments	61.9	64.9
6. Employed a pre-post test evaluation design	81.0	75.6
7. Used feedback questionnaires with persons directly served by program	73.8	77.1
8. Conferences with program participants	73.8	71.8
9. Staff meetings to consider formal and informal feedback	88.1	76.3
10. Follow-up meetings with former program participants	26.2	22.1
11. Employed statistical analysis to assess test results	69.0	58.0
12. Used teachers' diaries, logs, case studies or student records	61.9	58.0
13. Used techniques not listed above	2.4	9.9

TABLE B

PROJECT RATINGS* OF THEIR
EVALUATION ACTIVITIES

Evaluation Activities	Mean Ratings by Categories of Total Evaluation Group			
	I	II	III	IV
Design				
Degree to which final evaluation design was set forth in original proposal	6.8	7.0	7.4	7.0
Extent to which project was redirected as a result of process evaluation	5.8	5.0	5.0	4.3
Basis of Evaluation				
Observation by project staff	6.0	5.8	6.1	6.4
Observation by "outside" educator(s)	5.9	5.3	6.3	6.3
Systematic observation, such as interaction analysis	5.5	4.6	3.8	3.1
Analysis of standardized test results	6.8	6.5	5.6	2.0
Analysis of data gathered by means other than standard tests	7.4	7.1	6.8	5.6
Degree to which project objectives were stated in performance terms	8.5	7.9	7.1	7.0
Degree to which project was evaluated in terms of its objectives	8.8	8.5	7.6	7.3
Degree to which project objectives were modified during the project	6.3	5.4	4.4	5.0

*10 = completely, 5 = somewhat, 1 = not at all

TABLE C

PROJECT RATINGS* OF THEIR
EVALUATION ACTIVITIES

Evaluation Activities	Mean Ratings by Categories of Total Common Group			
	I	II	III	IV
Design				
Degree to which final evaluation design was set forth in original proposal	7.4	7.6	7.8	5.7
Extent to which project was redirected as a result of process evaluation	6.1	5.2	4.8	4.3
Basis of Evaluation				
Observation by project staff	6.8	5.9	5.6	6.3
Observation by "outside" educator(s)	6.6	5.3	5.6	6.2
Systematic observation, such as interaction analysis	6.0	4.9	2.5	4.3
Analysis of standardized test results	6.6	5.9	4.4	2.5
Analysis of data gathered by means other than standard tests	7.5	7.1	6.7	5.8
Degree to which project objectives were stated in performance terms	8.4	7.8	6.9	7.2
Degree to which project was evaluated in terms of its objectives	8.4	8.6	8.4	6.7
Degree to which project objectives were modified during the project	7.1	5.8	4.7	5.3

*10 = completely, 5 = somewhat, 1 = not at all

TABLE D

PROJECT RATINGS* OF THEIR EVALUATION ACTIVITIES
BY ACCEPTABLE AND UNACCEPTABLE CATEGORIES

Evaluation Activities	Mean Ratings by Combined Categories of Evaluation Group		
	I & II (Acceptable)	III & IV (Unacceptable)	All Projects
Degree to which final evaluation design was set forth in original proposal	7.0	7.3	7.1
Extent to which project was redirected as a result of process evaluation	5.3	4.8	5.0
Observation by project staff	5.9	6.2	6.0
Observation by "outside" evaluator(s)	5.5	6.3	5.9
Systematic observation, such as interaction analysis	4.8	3.5	4.3
Analysis of standardized test results	6.6	4.4	5.7
Analysis of data gathered by means other than standard tests	7.2	6.3	6.8
Degree to which project objectives were stated in performance terms	8.0	7.1	7.6
Degree to which project was evaluated in terms of its objectives	8.6	7.4	8.1
Degree to which project objectives were modified during the project	5.7	4.6	5.2

* 10 = completely, 5 = somewhat, 1 = not at all

TABLE E

PERCENTAGE OF PROJECTS
IN TOTAL EVALUATION GROUP BY CATEGORIES
INCORPORATING EDUCATIONAL AUDIT

	Categories			
Audit	I	II	III	IV
Yes	36.8	25.0	34.2	30.0
No	63.2	75.0	65.8	70.0

TABLE F

PERCENTAGE OF ACCEPTABLE AND UNACCEPTABLE PROJECTS
IN TOTAL EVALUATION GROUP
INCORPORATING EDUCATION AUDIT

	Categories		
Audit	I & II (Acceptable)	III & IV (Unacceptable)	TOTAL
Yes	28.4	32.8	30.4
No	71.6	67.2	69.6

TABLE G

NATURE AND DEGREE OF ASSISTANCE
STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENTS
RECEIVED BY PROJECTS

Service Provided	Percent of Projects Receiving Assistance				
	Category I	Category II	Category III	Category IV	Total Group
None	1.7	7.5	5.0	3.3	17.5
General Consultation	10.8	27.5	22.5	9.2	70.0
Conduct Project Evaluation	7.5	7.5	4.2	6.7	25.8
Design Project Evaluation Component	2.5	5.0	3.3	2.5	13.3
Disseminate Evaluation Results	3.3	11.7	11.7	5.0	31.7

TABLE H

RATING OF MEDIA COVERAGE
BY TITLE III ESEA PROJECTS

Categories	Number and Percent of Projects Responding by Categories				
	I (N=9)	II (N=35)	III (N=30)	IV (N=12)	All (N=86)
Ratings					
1 (Poor)	—	2(5.7%)	--	1(8.3%)	3(3.5%)
2	---	--	1(3.3%)	2(16.7%)	3(3.5%)
3	1(11.1%)	3(8.6%)	4(13.3%)	--	8(9.3%)
4	—	6(17.1%)	5(16.7%)	--	11(12.8%)
5 (Fair)	1(11.1%)	3(8.6%)	5(16.7%)	--	9(10.5%)
6	--	3(8.6%)	4(13.3%)	1(8.3%)	8(9.3%)
7	3(33.3%)	2(5.7%)	3(10.0%)	1(8.3%)	9(10.5%)
8	2(22.2%)	1(2.9%)	1(3.3%)	--	4(4.7%)
9	--	1(2.9%)	--	--	1(1.2%)
10 (Excellent)	1(11.1%)	3(8.6%)	--	--	4(4.7%)
No Reply	1(11.1%)	11(31.4%)	7(23.3%)	5(41.7%)	24(27.9%)
Median Rating	7	5	5	2	4.5

TABLE I

NEWSLETTERS PUBLISHED
BY TITLE III ESEA PROJECTS

Categories	Number and Percent of Projects Responding by Categories				
	I (N=9)	II (N=35)	III (N=30)	IV (N=12)	All (N=86)
Newsletters	7(77.8%)	21(60%)	6(20%)	0	34(39.5%)
Frequency:					
Monthly	2(22.2%)	8(22.9%)	5(16.7%)		15(17.4%)
Bi-Monthly	--	2(5.7%)	--		2(2.3%)
Other	4(44.4%)	7(20%)	1(3.3%)		12(13.9%)
No Reply	1(11.1%)	4(11.4%)	--		5(5.8%)
Copies:					
1-500	1(11.1%)	8(22.9%)	2(6.7%)		11(12.8%)
501-1000	1(11.1%)	4(11.4%)	--		5(5.8%)
1001-3000	1(11.1%)	4(11.4%)	1(3.3%)		6(6.9%)
3000+	4(44.4%)	4(11.4%)	3(10%)		11(12.8%)
No Reply	--	1(2.9%	--		1(1.2%)
No. Pages					
One	1(11.1%)	3(8.6%)	1(3.3%)		5(5.8%)
Two	1(11.1%)	3(8.6%)	3(10%)		7(8.1%)
Four	5(55.6%)	12(34.3%)	1(3.3%)		18(20.9%)
Six	--	--	1(3.3%)		1(1.2%)
Eight	--	2(5.7%)	--		2(2.3%)
Eight+	--	1(2.9%)	--		1
Printed by:					
Commercial Firm	4(44.4%)	8(22.9%)	1(3.3%)		13(15.1%)
Mimeograph	--	1(2.9%)	2(6.7%)		3(3.5%)
Office Offset Duplicator	3(33.3%)	8(22.9%)	3(10%)		14(16.3%)
Other Methods	--	1(2.9%)	--		1(1.2%)
No Reply	--	3(8.6%)	--		3(3.5%)

TABLE J

SPECIAL PUBLICATIONS OTHER THAN
NEWSLETTERS AND RELEASES UTILIZED
IN DISSEMINATION ACTIVITIES

Categories	Number and Percent of Projects Responding by Category				
	I (N=9)	II (N=35)	III (N=30)	IV (N=12)	All (N=86)
Publication					
Letters to Parents	4(44.4%)	15(42.9%)	13(43.3%)	2(16.7%)	34(39.5%)
Brochures	6(66.7%)	23(65.7%)	8(26.7%)	3(25.0%)	40(46.5%)
Program Summaries	7(77.8%)	14(40.0%)	8(26.7%)	2(16.7%)	31(36.0%)
Special Sections In Newspapers	2(22.2%)	12(34.3%)	2(6.7%)	1(8.3%)	17(19.8%)
Visitors' Guides	4(44.4%)	14(40.0%)	6(20.0%)	1(8.3%)	25(29.1%)
Plant Descriptions	1(11.1%)	4(11.4%)	2(6.7%)	—	7(8.1%)
Pamphlets	5(55.6%)	12(34.3%)	7(23.3%)	—	24(27.9%)
Articles In Professional Journals	5(55.6%)	13(37.1%)	4(13.3%)	—	22(25.6%)
Course Outlines	3(33.3%)	11(31.4%)	3(10.0%)	—	17(19.8%)
Instructional Guides	4(44.4%)	11(31.4%)	3(10.0%)	1(8.3%)	19(22.1%)
Lesson Plans	2(22.2%)	4(11.4%)	2(6.7%)	—	8(9.3%)

TABLE K

PROJECTS USING AUDIO-VISUAL PRESENTATIONS
IN ESEA III DISSEMINATION ACTIVITIES

Categories	Number and Percent of Projects Responding by Categories				
	I (N=9)	II (N=35)	III (N=30)	IV (N=12)	All (N=86)
Audio-Visual Presentation					
Slide-Tape Shows	9(100%)	22(62.9%)	18(60.0%)	3(25.0%)	52(60.5%)
Motion-Picture Films	4(44.4%)	10(28.6%)	6(20.0%)	--	20(23.3%)
Video Tapes of Instruction	6(66.7%)	20(57.1%)	6(20.0%)	--	32(37.2%)
Bulletin Boards	6(66.7%)	24(68.6%)	7(23.3%)	1(8.3%)	38(44.2%)
Still Photo Displays	7(77.8%)	26(74.3%)	14(40.0%)	--	47(54.7%)
Overhead Projections	7(77.8%)	18(51.4%)	11(36.7%)	2(16.7%)	38(44.2%)
Charts And Graphs	7(77.8%)	22(62.9%)	11(36.7%)	1(8.3%)	41(47.7%)
3-D Displays	4(44.4%)	3(8.6%)	--	--	7(8.1%)
Audio Tapes	6(66.7%)	7(20.0%)	3(10.0%)	1(8.3%)	17(19.8%)
35 mm. Slides	8(88.9%)	16(45.7%)	10(33.3%)	--	34(39.5%)
Film Strips	2(22.2%)	4(11.4%)	2(6.7%)	--	8(9.3%)

TABLE L

DIFFUSION ACTIVITIES
BY TITLE III ESEA PROJECTS

Categories	Number and Percent of Projects Responding by Categories				
	I (N=9)	II (N=35)	III (N=30)	IV (N=12)	All (N=86)
Activity					
Visits By Project Personnel To Other Educators	9(100%)	32(91.4%)	26(86.7%)	7(58.3%)	74(86.0%)
Visits By Project Personnel To Parents	5(55.6%)	26(74.3%)	14(46.7%)	2(16.7%)	47(54.7%)
Conferences With Area Educators	9(100%)	32(91.4%)	29(96.7%)	4(33.3%)	74(86.0%)
Observations By Educators Of ESEA III Activities	9(100%)	29(82.9%)	23(76.7%)	4(33.3%)	65(75.6%)
Teacher Exchanges Structured Into Project Design	5(55.6%)	13(37.1%)	12(40.0%)	1(8.3%)	31(36.0%)
Meetings To Orient Principals, Administrators	9(100%)	30(85.7%)	23(76.7%)	5(41.7%)	67(77.9%)
Inservice Programs Led By Project Staff	9(100%)	26(74.3%)	20(66.7%)	5(41.7%)	60(69.8%)
Tours By Visitors Of Demonstration Schools	8(88.9%)	26(74.3%)	12(40.0%)	4(33.3%)	50(58.1%)
Talks Before PTA's, Civic Groups, etc.	9(100%)	30(85.7%)	22(73.3%)	4(33.3%)	65(75.6%)

TABLE M

MEDIA EXPERIENCES OF TITLE III
ESEA DISSEMINATION DIRECTORS

Categories	Number and Percent of Projects Responding by Category				
	I (N=9)	II (N=35)	III (N=30)	IV (N=12)	All (N=86)
Experiences					
Newspaper	2(22.2%)	6(17.1%)	2(6.7%)	--	10(11.6%)
Radio	--	4(11.4%)	1(3.3%)	--	5(5.8%)
Television	2(22.2%)	5(14.3%)	2(6.7%)	--	9(10.5%)
School Public Relations	4(44.4%)	16(45.7%)	9(30.0%)	--	29(33.7%)
Commercial Public Relations	--	3(8.6%)	--	--	3(3.5%)
English/Journalism Teacher	3(33.3%)	8(22.9%)	2(6.7%)	3(25.0%)	16(18.6%)
Advertising Agency	2(22.2%)	6(17.1%)	5(16.7%)	--	13(15.1%)
Free Lance	--	1(2.9%)	1(3.3%)	--	2(2.3%)
Photography	3(33.3%)	3(8.6%)	--	--	6(6.9%)
School Publication Advisor	2(22.2%)	4(11.4%)	3(10.0%)	1(8.3%)	10(11.6%)

TABLE N

EXPERIENCE DEEMED USEFUL FOR
ESEA III DISSEMINATION PERSONNEL

Categories	Number and Percent of Projects Responding by Categories				
	I (N=9)	II (N=35)	III (N=30)	IV (N=12)	All (N=86)
Experience					
Daily Newspapers	5	16	15	5	41(47.7%)
Radio-TV	3	14	16	4	37(43.0%)
School Public Relations	7	28	17	5	57(66.3%)
Free Lance Writing	6	11	6	5	28(32.6%)
Photography	6	27	17	6	46(53.5%)
Weekly Newspapers	4	5	4	2	15(17.4%)
Educational Periodicals	3	17	10	4	34(39.5%)
Classroom Teaching	6	18	11	4	39(45.3%)
School Administration	3	11	12	3	29(33.7%)
Advertising	3	7	4	3	17(19.8%)
Commercial Public Relations	4	12	6	2	24(27.9%)

TABLE O

COMPARISON OF SELECTED DISSEMINATION
PRACTICES OF CONGRUENT AND TOTAL STUDY GROUPS

Dissemination Practices	Number and Percent of Projects	
	Common Group (N=42)	Total Group (N=86)
Projects Sending News Releases	35(83.3%)	70(81.4%)
Projects Providing Broadcast Copy	4(9.5%)	17(19.8%)
Median Rating Of Media Coverage (10-point scale)	6.85	4.5
Projects Publishing Newsletters	17(40.5%)	34(39.5%)
Projects Publishing Brochures	7(16.7%)	40(46.5%)
Projects Publishing Pamphlets	11(26.2%)	24(27.9%)
Projects With Articles In Professional Journals	14(33.3%)	22(25.6%)
Projects Using Slide Tape Shows	24(68.6%)	52(60.5%)
Projects Using Video-Tapes Of Instruction	15(35.7%)	32(37.2%)
Projects With Structured Teacher Exchanges	15(35.7%)	31(36.0%)

TABLE P

DISTRIBUTION OF NEWS RELEASES TO
AND USE BY AREA NEWSPAPERS

Categories	Number and Percent of Projects Responding by Categories				
	I (N=9)	II (N=35)	III (N=30)	IV (N=12)	All (N=86)
Projects Sending News Releases	9(100%)	32(91.4%)	24(80%)	5(41.7%)	70(81.4%)
Estimated % of Newspapers Printing Releases					
100%	4	17	13	3	37
50-99%	3	7	5	--	15
10-49%	1	2	1	--	4
-10%	--	3	2	--	5
No Check Available	1	2	--	2	5
No Reply	--	1	3	--	4

TABLE Q

PROJECTS WITH DISSEMINATION ACTIVITIES
ESPECIALLY SLANTED TOWARD BROADCASTING STATIONS

Categories	Number and Percent of Projects Responding by Categories				
	I (N=9)	II (N=35)	III (N=30)	IV (N=12)	All (N=86)
Dissemination Activities					
News releases tailored to broadcast needs	1(11.1%)	13(37.1%)	3(10%)	--	17(19.8%)
Telephone "beeper" reports	1(11.1%)	--	1(3.3%)	--	2(2.3%)
Spot announcements	4(44.4%)	5(14.3%)	3(10%)	--	12(13.9%)
ETV programs on project	2(22.2%)	4(11.4%)	1(3.3%)	2(16.7%)	9(10.5%)
Audio tapes	2(22.2%)	2(5.7%)	1(3.3%)	--	5(5.8%)
Film/video tapes for television	4(44.4%)	6(17.1%)	2(6.7%)	--	12(13.9%)
35 mm. slides for television	1(11.1%)	3(8.6%)	--	--	4(4.7%)
Regularly scheduled radio programs	1(11.1%)	1(2.9%)	--	--	2(2.3%)
Regularly scheduled TV programs	1(11.1%)	1(2.9%)	--	--	2(2.3%)

TABLE R

PROJECTS TARGETING SPECIAL PUBLICS TO RECEIVE
NEWSLETTERS AND OTHER TITLE III ESEA PUBLICATIONS

Categories	Number and Percent of Projects Responding by Category				
	I (N=9)	II (N=35)	III (N=30)	IV (N=12)	All (N=86)
Publics					
Educators within project area	8(88.9%)	27(77.1%)	1(3.3%)	--	36(41.9%)
Educators outside project area	6(66.7%)	23(65.7%)	4(13.3%)	--	33(38.4%)
Power structure of project area	4(44.4%)	16(45.7%)	2(6.7%)	--	22(25.6%)
Interested lay citizens	6(66.7%)	19(54.3%)	5(16.7%)	--	30(34.9%)
Parents of participating pupil	6(66.7%)	12(34.3%)	1(3.3%)	--	19(22.1%)
USOE officials	4(44.4%)	9(25.7%)	1(3.3%)	--	14(16.3%)
Legislative, Congressional representatives	3(33.3%)	7(20.0%)	--	--	10(11.6%)