DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 086 776 UD 014 039

AUTHOR Cupp, Marion E.; Farris, Dale
TITLE Annual Report and Evaluation, ESEA Title I (P. L. 89-10), Fiscal Year 1972.
INSTITUTION Washington Office of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Olympia.
PUB DATE 72
NOTE 41p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Annual Reports; Economically Disadvantaged; Educationally Disadvantaged; Educational Resources; *Migrant Child Education; *Program Evaluation; Pupil Personnel Services; Remedial Instruction; Resource Allocations; *State Surveys; Student Characteristics; Student Needs
IDENTIFIERS Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I; ESEA Title I Programs; Migrant Education Amendment; *Washington

ABSTRACT

In the State of Washington, 297 of 316 local school districts operated Title I, Elementary Secondary Education Act projects during Fiscal Year 1972 with approximately 12,272,000 dollars appropriated. The bulk of Title I funds (85 percent) supported project activities in the 25 largest school districts where most of the target populations are clustered. More than 56,000 public school children and 1,000 non-public school youngsters participated directly in Title I projects, and an estimated 380,000 public and 7,000 non-public students benefitted indirectly because of materials, support services, or instructional strategies that paced improvements in the general program within target area schools, even as the special needs of Title I children were being served. Nearly 1,000 dropouts also participated in special projects, and 1,000 other students were served through institutions for the neglected and delinquent. Ninety-eight percent of the elementary schools eligible to participate did so, and 211 of 216 (97 percent) eligible secondary schools actually served students. All of the 38 elementary non-public schools within eligible districts had students involved directly in Title I projects. None of three eligible non-public secondary schools participated. Only about one-half of the 127,234 low income eligible children are actually being served by Title I. (Author/JM)

State of Washington
SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION
Olympia, Washington

ANNUAL REPORT AND EVALUATION

ESEA Title I (P.L. 89-10)

Fiscal Year 1972

FRANK B. BROUILLET
State Superintendent of Public Instruction

C. R. Marshall
Deputy Superintendent of Public Instruction

Don Hair
Assistant Superintendent, Curriculum & Instruction

Rich Boyd
Director, Grants Management

Milo Long
Title I Program Supervisor, Grants Management Section

Prepared By:

Marion E. Cupp
Evaluation Consultant

with

Dale Farris
Program Information
Grants Management Section

INTRODUCTORY OVERVIEW

Special help is needed to help raise the educational attainment and rates of progress of children and youth who are at an educational disadvantage because they have special needs caused by poverty, neglect, delinquency, or cultural, geographic, ethnic or linguistic isolation. Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act is a significant source of support for that special help.

In the State of Washington, 297 of 316 local school districts operated Title I, ESEA projects during FY 1972 with approximately $12,272,000 appropriated. Grant awards ranged downward from $2,422,000 for Seattle, the State's largest city, to $217 for a small, isolated rural district. The bulk of Title I funds (85%) supported project activities in the 25 largest school districts where most of the target populations are clustered.

All 67 first class districts conducted project activities, and all but one of 174 second class districts participated. Ten of 66 third class (non-high school) districts did not, however. Numbers of districts participating with an Intermediate School District ranged from 55 (of 58) in ISD 101 to 9 (of 10) in ISD 103. In eight of the 14 ISD's,[1] all eligible LEA's conducted Title I projects; statewide only 19 districts did not; of these 19, all were districts with less than 200 total enrollment, with eight having less than 50 students enrolled.

More than 56,000 public school children and 1,000 non-public school youngsters particpated directly in Title I projects, and an estimated 380,000

[1]The number of ISD's was reduced to 12, effective January 1, 1973.

public and 7,000 non-public students benefitted indirectly because of materials, support services, or instructional strategies that paced improvements in the general program within target area schools, even as the special needs of Title I children were being served. Nearly 1,000 dropouts also participated in special projects, and 1,000 other students were served through neglected and delinquent institutions. Five hundred and fifty-three, or 98% of the 561 public elementary schools eligible to participate did so, and 211 of 216 (97%) eligible secondary schools actually served students. All of the 38 elementary non-public schools within eligible districts had students involved directly in Title I projects. None of three eligible non-public secondary schools participated.

Of the 754,362 students attending school in districts eligible for Title I projects, 127,234 (or nearly 17%) were considered low-income and eligible for participation. Only about one-half of these eligible children are actually being served by Title I. In a large majority of the Title I projects in Washington State, there is a waiting list of children whose educational needs could be treated if resources were available.

An additional 8,700 children were served by Title I each year under the Migrant Education Amendment (PL 89-750). These youngsters receive compensatory education assistance, over and above basic Title I help, in 197 schools in 43 school districts. In 1971-72 the total Migrant program involved 936 teachers, 314 aides, 56 counselors, 42 home visitors and 282 unpaid volunteers. Minority and low-income populations were represented in these staffing classifications, particularly as teacher aides, many of whom (an estimated 85% or more) are now in career develop-

ment sequences rather than on public assistance or marginal employment situations.

Within the total Title I state program, disadvantaged children are served by 1,757 teachers, 1,230 aides (including those with home-school liaison duties), and 139 supportive services people.

More than half of the regular Title I projects were designed to correct specific reading disabilities. In district after district, as well as at the State and national level, it was the reading inadequacy of disadvantaged youngsters that was identified as a critical need. Reading was the program priority, a vital key to elimination of the discrepancies that separate disadvantaged boys and girls from their more affluent classmates.

Other Title I projects stressed individualized instruction (13%), math (8%), pupil services (6%), language arts and social studies (4%), library services (2%), and other general academic areas (11%). But it was primarily to the remediation of reading difficulties that most Title I efforts were directed in Washington State during FY 1972.

In addition to the direct assistance that the program provided to children, ESEA Title I has exerted a strong influence upon the educational efforts within local school districts and upon the State Educational Agency. The program had its most immediate impact within the target school populations, but there were implications for the entire district in what happened during Title I activities.

The concept of project management by objectives--in fact, the whole notion of educational accountability--is becoming an integral part of the

Title I grants process at both local and state levels. School districts not only must identify the specific learning disabilities of individual students within a target school population but they must develop an approvable remediation project according to strict guidelines. Pupil needs have to be assessed and identified in concrete terms. Project objectives to meet those needs must be stated in behavioral terms that make it possible to evaluate whether or not pupil progress does in fact occur. And the procedures that are used to change pupil academic achievement rates must have proof or strong promise that they will do so. Movement throughout the State in the direction of educational accountability is being strengthened and accelerated by Title I.

Inservice training for teachers, aides, support personnel and administrators has additional carryover impact on activities outside of Title I projects. These special projects frequently require special skills in order to plan, manage and evaluate them. The instruction provided to Title I staff has given impetus for districts to seek similar kinds of leadership and expertise throughout the regular school program.

Title I stress upon comparability requirements caused local school districts to re-examine traditional patterns of distributing their resources, and many districts were able to move in directions to strengthen further the drive to provide equal educational opportunity to all boys and girls.

Title I had another kind of impact upon education, and in a direction and with a momentum that is largely unique to Title I and compensatory education programs like it. Community involvement in education, particularly parental participation in planning and evaluating the activities that help

their children, gained much in practice and theory from the Title I program. It was a new, sometimes painful experience for both the schools and the communities, but the entire process has resulted in changes that were, and will continue to be, beneficial to all children.

There was another advantage in community involvement. Many of the 1,230 aides employed in local projects were themselves members of the Title I target population. Without Title I, between 850 to 900 of these people in Washington State would be on public welfare or marginally employed. They would not be involved in career development sequences, nor would they be involved in an active, informed way in the educational progress of their children.

State Office staff developed, through operation of the Washington Title I program, and through involvement in local district projects, a heightened awareness of--and an increased ability to deal with--the educational problems of disadvantaged youngsters.

Because of the Title I program in Washington State, educational progress has occurred since 1965, and acceleration of this progress is taking place each year.

More importantly, children now are moving out of their disadvantaged dilemma, and their communities are gaining valuable, irreplaceable human resources.

DATA ANALYSIS

At the time of reporting, 363 separate reports from local educational agencies (LEA's) had been received. In the tables that follow, an attempt was made to examine the evidence submitted in terms of the following categories:

a. Whether data supporting the extent to which their objectives had been achieved had been presented or not, and further an attempt to classify their exhibits into one of the following classifications: Excellent (1), Good (2), Fair (3), Poor (4), Unacceptable (5).

b. The extent to which some type of an evaluation design or plan was evident from the document presented.

c. Whether or not the instruments chosen were reasonably appropriate to test what the program was purporting to accomplish.

d. The reported success or failure of the programs in terms of their objectives.

e. Whether LEA assessment of their success or failure was supported in terms of the data presented.

Of those districts reporting, only 23 presented supportive data adjudged to be of such exceptional clarity and precision as to be classified "Excellent". This constitutes 11% of the LEA's utilizing Title I funds. There were 25 districts adjudged as having presented supporting data of a "good" classification. These constituted 12% of those reporting. Thirty-seven or 18% submitted data to support their program effort in the (3) or "fair" class. Forty-seven or 23% submitted data that was acceptable but was of low quality. These, therefore, were classified as "poor". There were 75 districts whose reports were technically unacceptable in terms of the presentation of data to support their claims of success.

Table 1

Table Showing an Analysis of the Data Sections of District Evaluation Reports

Categories	Excellent	%	Good	%	Fair	%	Poor	%	Unacceptable	%
Extent to which adequate data was presented	23	11	25	12	37	18	47	23	75	36
Extent to which evaluation design was clear	5	02	9	04	79	38	9	04	105	51
Extent to which it could be determined if instruments were appropriate	5	02	9	04	104	50	9	04	80	39
Districts reporting success	144	70								
Districts reporting failure	10	05								
Districts reporting mixed	73	35								

These findings may be clouded by the fact that reporting procedures were not uniformly followed by the reporting agencies. Those districts who did acceptable jobs of reporting seemed largely to be those whose staff have had wider experience in managing and reporting on a wide variety of categorical funds. This experience, it would seem, has served to provide them with skills not possessed by the others. This situation indicates a need for training in those districts who lack these skills. Many of the reports that were considered unacceptable alluded to data which they had available but did not present. This could be the result of lack of understanding on their part, or lack of communication with the funding agencies regarding their requirements.

The results shown in Table 1 also call attention to a difference in interpretation among the LEA's as to what constitutes an adequate evaluation design. In many cases, the design to be utilized had to be inferred from the report in that it was sometimes not stated explicitly. In order to make an assessment, the reader took as an acceptable design any set of statements that would indicate the agency's intent to take repeated measures on some dimension, or to follow a student or group over time with some defined reporting system. In many cases, the intent of the district was not as clear as it should have been. This does not necessarily mean there was no design; it only indicates one was not communicated. This situation indicates another training need for LEA's.

Ninety-three districts gave evidence of an acceptable design by the above standards. There were 114 or 55% that were classified as

questionable due principally to the lack of information or lack of clarity of that which was presented. A number of the latter were felt to have selected either an inappropriate design or we were unable to find one in their report. There is reason to exhibit some concern; however, for the preponderance of those selecting an evaluation design who chose a pre-post model which relied heavily upon standardized achievement tests for their measures. The difficulty of achieving good sensitive measures of pupil progress with these instruments is well recognized in the literature. It would seem that considerable effort needs to be expended to aid these districts to plan and prepare effective indices of change to fit the particular needs being addressed by their programs. The use of standardized achievement tests can and often does provide useful information about the group as a whole, but in view of the individualized needs being addressed by the great majority of the programs examined, there is need for technical assistance to the LEA in designing and carrying out a meaningful evaluation focusing on individual pupil changes. These technical assistance workshops are now being conducted.

EVALUATION DESIGNS

The principle design utilized by the districts reporting was a traditional pre-post design without any attempt to make comparisons with any other group.

There seems to be only partial awareness on the part of many program managers of the inherent problems encountered that jeopardize internal validity. One of the major uncontrolled variables encountered was the lack of history. There were innumerable other effects influencing children other than the particular delivery system being utilized at the time of the projects. The effects of these variables were not given sufficient weight by many project evaluators. Thus, even if some projects achieved some success in reaching the goals and objectives being attempted, there was little chance of assigning the success completed to the particular method being employed.

Maturation is a factor neglected in many of the programs. No effort was determinable to allow for the effect of merely being around for an additional nine months.

One of the serious design problems encountered in virtually all of the reports was maximized in those summer school programs that used a standardized test in a test-re-test fashion over a period of merely three to four weeks. The mere retaking of the test within that short a period of time would almost invariably result in a different score and in all likelihood the score would move closer to the mean, thus giving an inaccurate picture of progress. A further difficulty encountered in the

designs employed was the apparent failure to account for turnover of students between first and second administration of the tests. Several programs failed to follow their original populations across time and reported only gain scores between the two test administrations.

Another problem encountered was that in many cases the students chosen were usually at the low end of the distribution of whatever instrument was being used. The regression toward the mean phenomena would account for growth being reported when it would be inappropriate to claim such progress.

Spontaneous remission, or the cumulative change in certain events which might have produced an earlier depression of scores could have accounted for some recorded change.

There are psychological reactions to testing itself, especially encountered among those students who have a long history of academic failure, that also might well mitigate against reliable and valid measures.

While it is possible that many of the districts reporting have no opportunity to utilize more reliable and dependable designs in setting up their evaluations, their frequent unawareness of these pitfalls when interpreting their results is evidence of an additional training need. It may be that these factors have been recognized, but simply have not been reported in their analysis. The format utilized by most districts could cause this result to occur.

Another design utilized by some has been labeled by Campbell and Stanley as the "One Shot Case Study". This is seen most frequently in those programs attempting to effect attitudinal change. There are inherent in this method all those difficulties listed for the one group pre-test, post-test design discussed above. In addition, many of the evaluations relied upon the observations of those who were delivering the instruction and who have the greatest probability of being highly involved in their work thereby often seriously influencing their judgment. Too few LEA reports contained evidence of attempts to establish a series of repeated measures across time on the same student. This is not to say, however, that there were not changes effected in the behavior and attitudes of the students--there probably were.[2] It is only to say that the data presented does not display those changes.

The LEA evaluation reports were also examined for the selection of appropriate instruments. In this area, considerable latitude was allowed. Frequently the reporting agency selected a standardized achievement test. Also utilized to a great extent were commercially made diagnostic tests. Curricular embedded tests were sometimes selected by agencies who were relying on a particular delivery system.

In the attitudinal or affective area, few instruments were named and fewer checklists or opinionnaires furnished for examination. This area is in serious need of technical assistance.[3]

[2]A major effort is underway now in FY 1973 projects to strengthen evaluation designs to prevent recurrence of the above weaknesses. Sixty percent of the Title I projects in the State of Washington had been monitored as of December 15, 1972.

[3]Twelve workshops have been scheduled for January through March of 1973 to remedy these deficiencies in Title I projects funded for FY 73.

A large number who listed objectives of an affective nature relied either on standardized achievement tests to give them information concerning students' attitudes, arguing that if a student improves academically his attitude also does. This, obviously, is a debatable point. Other districts relied heavily on the observation of teachers and/or other adults. It must be concluded that much of the affective changes reported are highly suspect from a methodological point of view. This, of course, does not infer that positive changes did not occur. It only indicates that the data presented to support those claims must be considered with caution.

Findings reported by the LEA's were almost all in positive terms. Of those reporting, only 10% indicated total lack of success and the evidence submitted would tend to show that the total design was not of sufficient precision to allow any conclusions to be made with certainty. It is felt that the reporting agencies drew these conclusions from data unavailable to the reader. Thirty-five percent of those reporting indicated both positive and negative outcomes of their programs. Some of these LEA's discussed briefly the areas in which they hope to bring about improvement during fiscal year 1973. Here again there is the probability that data exists in the field but was inadequately presented in the LEA reports.

Seventy percent of those reporting claimed some measure of success. In many cases there was little if any supporting data other than a simple statement claiming success in their endeavors.

Indications are the technical assistance given to the districts would be of use both to the LEA reporting and to the office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction in terms of providing some uniformity of data reporting which would allow the districts' programs to be efficiently presented and also to provide an accurate data base from which to monitor projects and derive needed information.[4]

Of the districts reporting positive or mixed positive and negative results, 78 supported their conclusions with enough data to make it possible to substantiate their conclusions based on the included results. These were, in most cases, tables of test results; however, in some cases narrative descriptions of actual events undertaken or services provided were included. Those categorized as acceptable ranged from excellent reports to some that were in need of technical assistance but were felt to be usable.

In summation, then, it would seem that for many of the projects there was not sufficient data to allow the reader to determine the validity of the reported success. These reports often took the form of mere statements of success with no attempt to provide supportive information. Again, it must be said that it may be that data is available in the district offering the program, and was not forwarded because there was unclear understanding as to what type of information was needed by the State.

[4]Quarterly and annual evaluation report forms have been revised for FY 73, and the Grants Management Section (in which Title I resides) monitoring procedures have been adjusted to conform to this changed format. Workshops have been scheduled to reinforce these changes.

An examination of the types of instruments utilized by the districts indicated that 150 reported using Standardized Achievement Tests and/or Standardized Reading Tests. In view of the types of objectives developed or anticipated in the projects, it seems that there is heavy reliance upon this type of instrument. There were 65 programs reported who from examination of the records relied wholly upon Standardized tests as their total source of information regarding progress toward their objectives. An examination of these projects indicates that the program could have profited from the inclusion of additonal information. It is felt, after having examined the reports, that the claim for success of the program, if valid, would often have had to be based upon additional data, much of it in all probability drawn from anecdotal or observational information. Therefore, it is recommended that in the next funding cycle projects be urged to include a better balance of instrumentation in order to present a clear, unambiguous examination of project results.

The reverse was also seen in a few projects who relied totally upon observational techniques to evaluate the impact of their program. While these represented a distinct minority of those reporting (only nine districts) the concern for a balanced evaluation design is still valid.

TYPES OF LEA PROJECTS

The LEA evaluation reports were examined to ascertain the types of project undertaken by them. The following table indicates the types of programs and the numbers attempting them. There were 363 separate programs operated by these districts. Of these 363, there were many that had separate and distinct parts to them, and these often covered more than one major area. In an attempt to break this down without attempting to arrive at an unduplicated count, we find as follows:

Table 2

Table Showing the Major Types of Programs Undertaken by LEA's and the Total Number in Each Category

Areas	Number	%	Area	Number	%
Language Arts/Social Studies	15	4	Drop Out	10	3
Reading	183	50	Community/Home Visitor	5	1
Math	29	8			
Music	3	1	Kindergarten	7	2
Pupil Services	23	6	Health	4	1
Individualized Instruction	13	4			
Library Services	6	2	Other	2	6
General Academic	45	11			
				363	

We see that the order of importance as taken from the frequency with which the districts attempted programs would be as follows:

Table 3

Table Showing the Rank Order of the District Funded Programs

Program Area	Percentage
Reading	50
General Academic	12
Math	8
Pupil Services	6
Individualized Instruction	4

Table 4

Table Showing Area Classification of those Objectives Judged to be Written with Sufficient Clarity as to Allow Measurement

Classification	Number	Percentage
Cognitive	323	81
Affective	51	13
Psychomotor	8	2
Unclassified	15	4
TOTAL	397	100

Another way to arrange this information so as to clarify the question concerning the ability to construct effective objectives for the district programs is seen in Table 5 below:

Table 5

Table Showing Number and Percentages of Objectives Written in LEA Reports Available at Time of Writing and Their Acceptability

Classification	Yes	No	Total	Percentage
Cognitive	323	94	417	69
Affective	51	95	146	24
Psychomotor	8	2	10	2
Unclassified	15	15	30	5
TOTAL	397	206	603	100

In order to more clearly view the priorities which emerged as districts developed their programs, the following table arranged these programs in terms of their frequency of occurrence.

Table 6

Table Listing Program Categories in Order of their Frequency of Useage

Program	%	Program	%
Reading	50	Library Services	2
General Academic	11	Kindergarten	2
Math	8	Health	1
Pupil Services	6	Music and Art	1
Individualized Instr.	4	Community/Home-Visitor	1
Language Arts/Soc. St.	4		
Drop Out	3	Other	6

There were other dimensions examined in the reports in an attempt to determine the consistency with which the districts reported results. One obvious area of difficulty was in the statements of objectives. There could be expected to be a direct correlation between the clarity and

preciseness with which a district states their objectives and the precision with which they are able to report their findings. With this in mind, an examination of the objectives of each program was undertaken. The results of this are indicated below. Of those classified as imprecise, they were examined to determine the area toward which they were directed as cognitive, affective, tests. The following table indicates the findings.

Table 7

Table Giving Total Number of Objectives Written and Their Classification as to Precision

Classification	Number	Percentage
Number Written with Sufficient Precision as to allow for Measurement	394	65
Number Written with Insufficient Precision As to Hinder Accurate Measurement	209	35
TOTAL	603	100

The tables above lend support to the contention that while the workshops held for LEA's under the auspices of the State Office have partially succeeded in helping districts to state their cognitive needs more clearly in measurable terms, additional inservice in this area is necessary. It is in the area of affective change that districts are experiencing difficulty. While this is a phenomena that is being experienced elsewhere and is acknowledged in much of the literature, this should not preclude continued stress being placed upon this area.

In the area of technical assistance, considerable effort could be expended here. An examination of the districts' evaluation reports indicates that with few exceptions the small rural isolated systems do a much less effective job of designing programs, and from the written evidence submitted, also do a much less effective job of evaluating project results. All the critical remarks relative to the requirements for adequate reporting come from the smaller, less adequately staffed school systems. There is an implication here, as well, for the technical assistance role that might be filled by Intermediate School District staff.

While there is no ready solution to this problem, it is clear that the funding agencies have an obligation to clearly and unambiguously set forth the requirements and expectations of the grant in order that there be as little misunderstanding as possible. Further, because there is less likelihood of the small districts becoming larger and wealthier, some accessible source of program design and management aid must be made available to them--perhaps even made a requirement of the grant.

An examination of the types of projects undertaken by districts this past year indicates that the predominate category funded were in the area of reading remediation (50%). While projects in math, principally remedial, was third in order of number funded, it was far down the scale from the top choice (reading) with only 8% of the projects by number.

The identification of proven practices in a wide variety of the need areas, such as expressed in Table 2 showing the major types of programs undertaken by LEA's, together with a description of the conditions and critical variables under which the program gained its success, could be used as powerful tools by funding agencies in their negotiations with applicant districts for categorical funds.

An examination of the evaluation reports discussed herein suggests that many of the project directors either are not aware of these proven practices, lack the support and management skills necessary to implement them within their districts, or are overburdened by other administrative responsibilities.

DETERMINATION OF ELIGIBILITY

The determination of eligibility has caused some concern on the part of districts. In an attempt to examine the criteria used for selection, an examination of the proposals of each submitting district was made.

The sources that were utilized most frequently to determine which area within the local district was to be served, or in the case of a small district claiming the toal system to be eligible were:

a. U.S. Census Bureau
b. Department of Public Assistance - Aid to dependent children
c. Free Lunch Progam
d. School Surveys done among their own population
e. Health statistics
f. Housing statistics
g. Employment statistics
h. Other - this category included such as:
    1. foster home surveys
    2. neighborhood center surveys
    3. CAP profile
    4. food stamps
    5. local ministerial association
    6. NYC statistics
    7. head start
    8. county planning data

While the above many not exhaust the sources utilized, they do serve to illustrate the effort made on the part of LEA's to gather factual information regarding the needs of their service area.

Tables were derived by listing which of the various resources were utilized. The tables indicated that almost never did a district rely upon a single criterion, but in most cases used multiple criteria. Only two districts reported using as few as two criteria and the range extended through as many as seven. Table 8 divides the reporting and Intermediate

School Districts who served as the coordinating and reporting agency for the small districts who formed consortiums for program purposes.

Table 8

Table Showing the Number of Times a Resource was Utilized by Reporting Agencies in Determining Eligibility

REPORTING AGENCY	U.S. CENSUS BUREAU	AID TO DEPENDENT CHILDREN	FREE LUNCH	SCHOOL SURVEY	HEALTH STATISTICS	HOUSING STATISTICS	EMPLOYMENT STATISTICS	OTHER
LEA's	76	161	355	124	59	44	68	66
I.S.D.		4	3	4	2	1	3	1
Totals	76	165	358	128	61	45	71	67

The count above is duplicated in the case of LEA's due to the fact that schools often used different criteria for their different target schools. The principal value of the table lies not in its ability to display the resources used for each serving district, but in the depiction of the extent to which districts rely upon the data from certain service bureaus to establish their need statements.

As seen from Table 8, the resources utilized in order of their frequency of use were:

1. free lunch programs
2. aid to dependent children
3. school surveys
4. U.S. Census Bureau
5. employment statistics
6. other
7. health statistics
8. housing statistics

Of the first three resources tabulated as being of prime importance, both the first and third place ranking are difficult areas upon which to establish clear cut deliniations. The free lunch program while in itself undoubtedly is a worthwhile program, has its eligibility based upon criteria which are often difficult for school administrators to follow with precision. The point being, that the more often one uses information that are several times removed from their original source, the more susceptible they become to error and thus the less reliable and valid the information becomes. This is especially important in that all three of the prime choices rest upon selection criteria that are liable to considerable error in selection. It would seem rather useful for eligibility criteria to be developed from a source that is as free from error as possible.

There are within the state, 316 districts eligible to receive support under Title I, ESEA. Of those, a total of 297 actually undertook projects.

Table 9 gives a description of the participating districts and relationship between the total number of schools within the districts, the number of schools declared eligible for Title I services and the actual number of schools that actually served students.

Table 9

Table Showing the Number of Schools Serving Title I Students
In the State of Washington

	Number of schools within the participating districts			Number of schools within participating districts eligible for programs			Number of schools within participating districts actually serving students		
	Elem.	Sec.	Total	Elem.	Sec.	Total	Elem.	Sec.	Total
LEA Projects									
Public	955	465	1420	561	216	777	553	211	764
Non-Public	150	27	179	38	3	41	38	3	41
ISD Projects									
Public	46	21	67	41	14	55	41	14	55
Non-Public	---	---	----	---	---	---	---	---	---
Total									
Public	1001	486	1487	602	230	832	594	225	819
Non-Public	150	29	179	38	3	41	38	3	41
GRAND TOTAL	1151	515	1666	640	233	873	632	228	860

It is apparent from Table 9 that of the number of schools within the participating districts that were eligible for support, 98% actually participated from the public sector served by individual LEA's. Within the nonpublic schools who were served by eligible LEA's, 41 were eligible and 100% participated. It is of some interest to note that 561 elementary schools were eligible for programs and 553 for 98% were served, and of the 216 secondary schools eligible, 211 or 97% were served. Thus we find the emphasis in the program placement being practically equal in terms of the public-nonpublic dimension.

The same trend can be seen in the nonpublic schools served by individual LEA's. Here there was 100% participation in all eligible in both elementary and secondary. One of the most frequent complaints found in reports of the participating schools was the lack of adequate resources to accomplish their goals. Perhaps some prioritizing of effort would be in order. Through the guidance of the State Office, program proposals could be screened and assistance given to the applicant in helping him determine his area of principal need to be served with the resources available.

When one examines the efforts of the districts working with the ISD cooperatives, we see the same trend. The major difference being that there were no nonpublic schools reported as being either in their districts who were eligible, or if there were, they were not reported and consequently there were none served. Thus we see that of all the schools both public and nonpublic found eligible for programs, 98% of them were actually carrying out programs.

A further look at this finding is seen in Table 10. Here we examine the enrollment within the target school and the number of students actually identified as needing the service offered in those buildings. This table is grouped by LEA's who operated their own programs, programs coordinated among LEA's - usually smaller ones - by their Intermediate School District, and cooperatives formed by groupings of LEA's alone. Also under examination will be the nonpublic schools served under these arrangements.

From an examination of Table 11, it is apparent that the students participating constitute about 12% of the enrollment in the target elementary schools, and about the same percentage in the high schools (12.8%). The nonpublic schools on the other hand served 14% of their elementary schools and while there were three secondary schools that were eligible, records indicate no programs operated there. Thus, it would seem that nonpublic schools focused their efforts upon the elementary pupil.

In the programs coordinated by the Intermediate School Districts, approximately 16% of the elementary children participated in the program while 12% of the secondary population was served.

Of the programs operated in cooperation with LEA's, about 14% of the elementary students were involved in programs. Twelve percent of the secondary population of the target schools were involved in programs. Looking at the nonpublic schools who were eligible for programs within the service area of these cooperatives, 223 students were identified

Table 10

Table Showing Pupil Enrollment of the Districts
Eligible for Title I Programs

	DISTRICT ENROLLMENT					ELIGIBLE TO BE ENROLLED		
	Elem.	Sec.	Total	Low-Inc.	%	D.O.	Other	Total
LEA's								
Public	394,358	317,581	711,939	125,459	17.62	8,819	1,286	10,105
Non-Public	26,530	4,406	30,936	---		---	---	
ISD's								
Public	7,216	4,271	11,487	1,775	15.46	80	4	84
Non-Public	0	0	0	---		---	---	
Total								
Public	401,574	321,852	723,426	127,234	17.58	8,899	1,290	10,189
Non-Public	26,530	4,406	30,936	---		---		
GRAND TOTALS	428,104	326,258	754,362	127,234	16.87	8,899	1,290	10,189

Table 11

Table Showing Target School Pupil Enrollment in Target School

	Target School Enrollment			Students Participating		
	Elem.	Sec.	Total	Elem.	Sec.	Total
LEA's						
Public	291,338	130,044	421,382	36,200	16,736	52,936
Non-Public	6,529	455	6,984	937	0	937
ISD's						
Public	6,787	3,095	9,882	1,057	383	1,440
Non-Public	0	0	0	0	0	0
Coop.'s						
Public	3,886	1,425	5,311	532	168	700
Non-Public	223	0	223	15	0	15
Totals						
Public	302,011	134,564	436,575	37,789	17,287	55,076
Non-Public	6,752	455	7,207	952	0	952
Grand Totals	308,763	135,019	443,782	38,741	17,287	56,028

Dropouts Participating in Title I Projects

Public	858
Non-Public	0
TOTAL	858

and 15, or about 7%, were involved in project activities. There were no nonpublic secondary schools identified as target schools.

Of those programs offered for students of secondary schools, a total of 858 pupils identified as drop-outs were provided service within the public school framework. There were no drop-out programs offered by the nonpublic secondary schools; in fact, all nonpublic programs were concentrated at the elementary level.

Looking at the total percentage served, 12% of the elementary population of both public and nonpublic systems were participants in Title I.

If the districts whose reports were available at the time of writing were arranged into their Intermediate District service areas and examined for the percentage of those whose evaluation reports met minimum standards, and the percentage of those whose reports did not meet minimum standards, they would be arranged as seen in Table 12.

It is of importance to note the Intermediate School Districts where the majority of the better evaluation reports occurred. There were ISD #105 with 58%, ISD #106 with 83%, ISD #110 with 69%. The schools that contributed most to these results have actively engaged in training workshops offered under the auspices of the State Office of Education for the past two or three years. There is a high correlation seen between the evaluation reports submitted by those districts adjudged satisfactory and those who have previously involved their staff in training under state auspices.

Table 12

Table Showing the Number of Districts Judged to have Evaluation Format That meets Minimum Criteria Listed by Intermediate School District

ISD	SATISFACTORY		UNSATISFACTORY	
	No.	%	No.	%
101	8	29	20	71
102	3	38	5	63
103	2	33	4	67
104	3	38	5	63
105	7	58	5	42
106	10	83	2	17
107	2	33	4	67
108	2	18	9	82
109	1	13	7	88
110	9	69	4	31
111	3	33	6	67
112	10	43	13	57
113	6	27	16	73
114	4	40	6	60

It was unclear at the time LEA evaluations were reviewed as to the extent to which Intermediate School Districts have entered into the field of technical assistance and have offered training and consultation in the development of programs and their accompanying evaluation components. But from the distribution of the districts experiencing difficulty with evaluation designs, the ISD's could offer a readily available source of aid, assuming the expertise is available with them. The Grants Management Section of SPI now is helping ISD personnel raise their level of expertise to allow for maximum effective contact to the districts that lie within their boundaries.

Another question that is worthy of discussion is the distribution of types of programs by geographic arrangement. Table 13 attempts to show the distribution of various types of programs within the boundaries of the Intermediate School Districts. These were chosen as points of reference due to their geographic distribution in the State. Here we see that the districts reporting are arranged in terms of their various types of programs attempted within their Intermediate District.

There was only one project classification that was utilized by all local districts within each Intermediate School District. That major one was reading. If the distribution of programs are any indication of expressed need, reading would seem to be the educational problem considered most pressing in Washington State. This only supports what we have seen in other tables. It does point up the fact that the problem is generalized and not peculiar to any particular area or geographic region. The per-

Table 13

Table Showing the Percentage of the Distribution of the Types Of Projects by Intermediate School District

Type of Project	Intermediate School District													
	101	102	103	104	105	106	107	108	109	110	111	112	113	114
Unclassified	03	17	06	08	07	06	09	05	07	05	06	02	05	16
Community/ Home Visitor	03								03					05
Health	02				03					03			03	
Language Arts	03	08	06			13		05	03	03	11	05	11	
Reading	52	33	44	38	48	63	55	63	57	37	39	65	47	53
Math	07	17	19	15	07	13	18	11		13	11		05	
Music	02				03							02		
Pupil Services	05	08	19	08	10	06		05	03	03	06	05	11	05
Individualized Education	02			08	10				07	05		02	05	05
Library Serv.	02				07		09			03		02		
Basic Ed.	18	08	06	23			09	11	10	18	28	14	05	16
Drop Out	03				03				10	05	06		03	
Kindergarten	02									05	06	02	05	

centage figures listed in Table 13 do not give any indication of the numbers of children involved in these programs, but from examination of the evaluation reports, it is readily apparent that the large majority of students were involved in some type of reading program.

The area entitled Basic Education also ranks high in the number of Intermediate School Districts having projects of this type. This classification was used to identify programs whose scope and breadth encompassed more than one major area, i.e., reading and/or math. The objectives of these projects were usually much more inclusive than those of a highly focused program and included such skills as spelling, math, reading, oral and written communication, etc. Therefore, it could be said that all programs listed under basic education included reading and math, but these were not listed as the primary focus of the program. With the exception of Intermediate School Districts 105 and 106, all areas had at least one program stressing basic education and the two exceptions had programs specifying both reading and math as primary target areas.

In terms of state coverage, of those programs whose major intent or principal method of delivery seemed to be focused upon services to children of a support nature such as counseling, guidance, career awareness and specialized role models, there was at least one of these operating in each ISD except ISD 107. Here, there currently is a county-wide pupil service program aimed specifically at career awareness and counseling funded under ESEA Title III. It is apparent from examination of Table 13 that the need for support services to students is seen to be of some

priority. The extent to which districts attempted to build affective objectives into their projects is seen as another piece of evidence substantiating the recognized need for more effective means of maintaining and/or creating favorable attitudes toward learning on the part of their students. It is precisely in this area that much of the difficulty in program development seems to lie. Examination of the district reports fails to uncover projects that could be considered to be of an exemplary nature or from the evidence submitted, wholly effective. The lack of clarity in reporting results does not necessarily indicate a poor project. Often a person was hired, or a part-time staff member assigned and charged with the responsibility of effecting the desired attitude change. It was not always possible to determine what procedures were being used to effect the change, nor was it possible in many cases to determine completely what results occurred. The affective results generally relied upon the direct reporting of those employed to deliver the service. Despite these problems, there is ample evidence of need. The development of strong, well-designed programs in this area is seen as essential and desired by the districts.

The Unclassified category is made up of those programs that did not easily fit under any of the other headings used. These were, for the most part, one-of-a-kind and usually addressed themselves to unique needs of the particular district reporting. For example, Port Angeles ran a summer program relating to Indian Culture and Heritage. This unclassified category was contributed to in a large part by the summer programs

which were often, of necessity, programs of short duration and therefore were not always in keeping with the goals and objectives of the program operated during the regular year.

One of the delivery modes beginning to show up across the State is classified under the heading of Individualized Education. This perhaps is somewhat of a misnomer in that an examination of those programs so classified indicates that they almost all have certain basic ingredients in common. They seem to all have been derived from the behavioral model variously known as Behavioral Management, Precision Teaching, etc. The principle ingredient seems to be the identification of precise operant behaviors which are to be targets for modification and, then through the process of contingency management, attempts are made to effect an increase or decrease in the target behavior(s). This particular mode of teaching is somewhat new in Title I programs in this State. There are several sources of reinforcement for methodology of this persuasion. These rest principally within the colleges and universities of the State, although not all of the institutions of higher learning are espousing this methodology or have advocates for it. The establishment of the Title I programs so identified, however, are geographically located in the vicinity of one of these colleges and universities that do in fact have at least minimum programs in this methodology. The particular flavor of the program can often be traced to the various colleges who offer coursework and/or training in this methodology.

The evaluation design of this type of instructional process is rather straight-forward and deviates rather markedly from those generally seen in the traditional educational research. This method has been called the N-1 design. Here the subject is the source of study and becomes in effect his own control. The entering level of performance of the behavior under question is determined and repeated measures or observations, often expressed in rates of behavior per unit of time, are taken. These measures are displayed in tabular and graphic form and statements of achievement or non-achievement are made from this data. One of the principal requisites for this method is the ability to state clearly and precisely the behavior that will be under investigation, i.e. the objective. It is of particular interest to note that programs utilizing this approach seem to be able quickly and accurately to focus on the problem and respond within a reasonable period of time. It may well offer a methodology to the program manager that will increase the number of evaluation tools normally at his disposal, and help to eliminate some of the reporting difficulties noted above.

The distribution of programs specifically aimed at early childhood education seems to be located principally in the Puget Sound area. While these programs were certainly not numerous, they do represent an attempt on the part of some districts within a region to intervene at an early time. The only exception to the regional grouping pattern is one appearing in the Intermediate School District 101 which represents the northeast portion of the state. The few numbers of population con-

centration centers in the State may well have something to do with this, as the units reporting are more numerous in these areas and thus the probability of their occurring is better. Nevertheless, with all of the areas reporting a high number of programs aimed at remediating the basic area subjects, there are few programs in the early childhood area.

Many of the areas not engaging in this type of program are in the rural, sparsely populated sections of the State and may well not have sufficient population in the individual schools to develop a total program per se. In fact, as one examines the population distribution of these schools, one finds that many are third class districts consisting of single building schools. Some are non-high school districts. There are those for whom operating with multiple grades in each room becomes the rule and not the exception. With the population distributed across the grades in that fashion and the number of students overall being small, this also produces a minimum support level from ESEA Title I. This reduced amount of money limits to a significant degree the breadth and scope of the program which the district can mount. The resources often only allow for minimum staffing and are not sufficient to provide the real technical expertise necessary to implement successfully an adequate program even if it were available.

Two other problems face the rural, isolated district that are worthy of note. One: With a restricted student population, the segregation of non-performers for specialized treatment from those who function adequately, creates more problems than it solves. The lives of these children

are intimately bound up with each other in a unique way because of their rural isolation. Nothing happens to one that does not in some real way effect his relationship with others. Therefore, any program to be successful, must take this important dynamic into serious consideration. This, of course, should not result in watering down or denying the remediation being offered to the student, as it sometimes does, but it does make the job of pinpointing and delivery of service a most complex and difficult one. This, it is suggested, is an entirely different problem than that faced by the larger district that experiences high concentration of eligible students.

The second problem faced by the small rural district lies, in part, in the fact that the small numbers of students eligible for service in any given category or developmental area seriously interferes with the economics of good program management. There are minimum costs incurred in the mounting of any program. The focusing of adequate physical and personnel resources to assure expected growth produces a cost per pupil that is far in excess of that experienced by programs that have adequate numbers around which to develop an economically sound unit. This disparity is often so readily apparent to the cost-conscious administrator that he is unwilling to focus his resources this narrowly. This often results in the program being broadened either in range or scope until the staff employed find themselves unable to meet expectations. Further, the resources become so diffused among the general support monies that it becomes difficult to maintain an effective budget trail.

The difficulties experienced by the smaller districts in developing, carrying out and evaluating their projects may be the results one could expect when the circumstances are as they have been described above. A large majority of the school districts in this State are of small size, and all face severe fiscal and administrative problems in attempting to carry out an adequate educational program.