DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 243 587 PS 014 280

AUTHOR McDaniels, Garry L.
TITLE A Federal Administrator's Perspectives on the Documentation of School Improvement Efforts.
INSTITUTION General Accounting Office, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Mar 81
NOTE 26p.; Paper presented at the Learning Research and Development Center/National Institute of Education Conference on Follow Through (Pittsburgh, PA, March 12-13, 1980).
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrative Principles; Beliefs; Data Collection; Demonstration Programs; Diffusion (Communication); *Educational Improvement; *Federal Government; *Government Role; *Program Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS *Project Follow Through

ABSTRACT

Aimed at persons planning and implementing strategies for documenting school improvements, this paper is comprised of four sections. The first section distinguishes between national problems in education and federal issues in education (a distinction considered necessary for planning evaluations and establishing priorities for federally sponsored investigations.) The second section distinguishes between belief and knowledge and discusses the relationship between belief and administrative action. The third section describes federal program evaluation, as conducted in the early 1980's, and comments on gathering data and using private sector contractors. The fourth section focuses on the reporting and diffusion of evaluation work. In conclusion, some thoughts about the future of the Follow Through program are offered. (RH)

A FEDERAL ADMINISTRATOR'S PERSPECTIVES ON THE DOCUMENTATION OF SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT EFFORTS

March 1981

Garry L. McDaniels
Institute for Program Evaluation
The United States General Accounting Office
441 G Street, NW
Washington, D.C.

This paper was presented at a conference sponsored by the National Institute of Education and the Learning Research and Development Center of the University of Pittsburgh.

Introduction

This paper was prepared under the guidance of the title of this session: Perspectives on the Documentation of School Improvement Efforts: Philosophical, Methodological, and Practical Considerations. In the past decade, I have sponsored evaluation work and administered federal research, demonstration and entitlement efforts in education. This paper will draw heavily on that experience but, hopefully, be within the bounds of the guidance.

In reviewing the background of those participating in these paper writing sessions, I appear to be the only entitlement program administrator presenting, therefore I hope to make this a somewhat personal set of observations on the acquisition and utilization of "facts" by federal administrators. The interpretation and generalizations which might come from these observations are left, in part, to the reader and the excellent discussants.

Four groups of observations comprise this paper. The first part discusses the role of belief and knowledge in program administration. The second describes the federal program evaluation--what a federal program evaluation is beginning to appear to be as we enter the eighties. The third set of observations deals briefly with the dissemination of diffusion of evaluation work, and the fourth provides some observations on the purchase of evaluation components.

National Problems and Federal Issues

Our purpose in these sessions is to offer advice to people planning and implementing efforts to document school improvement efforts. The federal sector has channeled large numbers of dollars

into fairly visible efforts. However, I feel it is important to begin this paper by raising the distinction between national problems and federal issues.

Even with billions of dollars in the federal budget dedicated to educational endeavors, people continue to ask that the federal role be clarified. There is a continuing uneasiness about the coherence of the federal efforts and a continuing uneasiness about the intrusiveness of the federal sector into state and local matters.

There are a number of problems which face classroom teachers, buildings and district level administrators, and state level administrators. More critically, the problems faced by an individual at any level within a state is often the same as problems faced by a counterpart in other states. For example, when the metric conversion began to be a real possibility, curriculum content and classroom materials were very limited. Congress decided, because the problem was a frequent event, a national problem, a nationally funded effort should stimulate the production of curriculum and material. The Congress did not see this as a federal curriculum--needless to say.

National problems are quite clearly those problems which (1) appear with some frequency and (2) appear to be distributed quite widely among the states. The field of education confronts such problems. For example, children in low income schools as a group, score more poorly on standardized achievement tests than children from middle class neighborhoods. Even with supplemental funds such as Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Act flowing to

these schools, the problem persists. This gave rise to legislation to authorize federally approved demonstration activities to assure that successful programs were developed and given visibility. In this example, the perceived problem was the money available for quality programming in individual schools. The Congress decided to intervene, but not with a federal curriculum.

For the sake of argument, I would like to suggest that many educational problems are "unnatural" federal issues. I used the term "unnatural" because the instrumentality of the federal government in education is not designed to assist children directly (with the exception of the defense schools). The national contact with children is either through the state government and the local education agency or, on occasion, bypassing the state and going directly to the local education association. The Education for All Handicapped Act (P.L. 94-142) provides an illustration. This Act creates numerous changes in the way in which the schools interact with handicapped children and their parents. However, the state is the agency with whom the federal funding agency deals. In attempting to monitor compliance with this Act federal staff visit schools and classrooms and families within states. However, the reason for these visits is to assure that (1) policies which had previously been reviewed at the state capitol were disseminated to and understood by local education agencies and (2) monitoring by the state was sufficient to assure that violations would be found and corrected. Federal teams find discrete violations of the federal statute rather frequently. These violations are referred to the state for follow-up. The violations of

more direct concern for federal officials are those which suggested that systematic problems were occurring; problems which might be related to inadequate monitoring by the state officials or inadequately, or unwillingly dissemination and implementation of state policies which have been redrafted to be in conformance with EHA.

As concerned human beings, we wanted the children to get the best quality programming possible. As federal bureaucrats, we did not deal with these events, except to the extent reoccurring problems may have represented policy inconsistencies between federal and state statutes or regulations, or may have represented a weak strategy of local school monitoring by the state. In the area of the handicapped, the federal issue was the extent to which the state was actively pursuing the goal of a "free, appropriate public education" for those handicapped students. The reason for looking at the children's program was to assess the state's actions.

The Office of Special Education in the Education Department also has demonstration programs. The excellent people running these programs are primarily interested in producing high quality experiences for children who happen to have handicaps. As a federal administrator, I had the following goals for the program: (1) Quality. Evaluation was essential by the project developers. we could not affort to have the credibility of these demonstration challenged. The purpose was to display excellence. 1/ (2) Distribution. The projects had to be widely distributed both among the states (We would send a team into states to drum up interest if one was without a project.); among urban and rural

areas; among distinctive subgroups of the American population.
(3) Recruitment. The field which provides education services to young children was judged to be too small and too thin. One of the major purposes of demonstrations is to create and nurture performing fields. As a result, the number of personnel trained, the number of publications, the location of publications, and the presentations in national forums were carefully monitored.
(4) Diffusion. The projects served every handicapped condition. All were supported with a mix of federal and local or state funds. (A condition of the grant was the strong indication that local funding would assume the cost of the project at the end of three years.) Projects were located in very different settings in order to have examples which be a challenge to any skeptic. As a result, there were devastating arguments against people who said: "It cannot be done. These children will not benefit from an education." As a result, the project became visitor centers--and the number of visitors were monitored in sites. They distributed information--and the numbers of materials developed were monitored. A subset of the projects were given funds for travel and training at the end of three years but no more project funds. The projects had to be alive on local or state funds.

The demonstrations were designed to meet a widely distributed problem in this country. Programs for children age 0-6 were few in number, poorly distributed, and the personnel had neither time nor money to monitor their effectiveness much less study and write about what they were doing.

The Congress assumed that provision of services was a good idea and that such programs would be effective. 2/ What was desired was greater distribution of services. This required people and communication. The federal issue was to attract people to the cause and help networks develop across state boundries. I purpose that these issues are reasonably "natural" for the federal establishment. The programming that goes on within the site is a less "natural" agenda for the federal establishment.

The perspective this line of argument is developing is that the primary federal issues of intent when documenting these school improvement efforts are those having to do with the level of the human resources actively engaged in assisting handicapped children and the characteristics of the network which is being developed to diffuse this program. A person working in a school site or at the state department of education would have a different perspective and therefore a different set of focal variables. The nature and quality of the specific curriculum intervention would be a "natural" interest.

Belief and Knowledge

A perspective on the documentation of school improvement efforts changes when moving from the administration for federal demonstration programs to the administration of federal entitlement progams. By definition administrators and policy makers are constantly performing. A program exists. Their job is to run and modify the program. As a result, administrators and policy makers run on what they have in the way of belief and knowledge.

Since I feel the importance of belief in the operation of this country's business is underrated, the purpose of this section is to discuss the terms "belief" and "knowledge" and emphasize the significant role of belief in the administration of programs.

Bertrand Russell defined belief and knowledge in a useful chapter in Human Knowledge. 3/ Belief was defined by a number of descriptions. An example of a belief appears when a person says, "The child is handicapped, she will perform poorly." A belief is also displayed by the person who says, "the school has unstructured classrooms. The place is going to be chaotic." Belief then is the state or condition of a person's thinking. The belief has an external reference. The people in the examples above encounter situations and expect a given event because of a belief. This also illustrates the relationship of facts to beliefs. Russell notes that truth is a property of beliefs. The truth of a belief depends on having some intelligible experience (fact) behind it. Whether you are administering federal programs or guiding a family, there are abundant facts for all sorts of beliefs. True beliefs are plentiful, conflicting and often difficult to forget.

In contrast, knowledge is a subset of beliefs. In the area of education, for example, there are numerous examples of beliefs which are not knowledge. The belief that highly structured settings are important for child learning is supported by intelligible experience; by numerous facts. However, the belief that undefined space is important for child learning is similarly supported by experience or facts. Some larger, more encompasing

concept is probably the generic basis for both of these beliefs. Similarly, many believe that tension is destructive to performance. Others believe that tension is necessary for performance. These beliefs are both supported by a number of facts. The evidence that performance has been found to have an inverted "U" shape function as tension is increased according to a linear function allows us to have knowledge which encompasses the two apparently conflicting beliefs.

Russell defines knowledge as having a somewhat higher standard to met than belief. 4/

> What character in addition to truth must a belief have in order to count as knowledge? The plain man would say that there must be sound evidence to support the belief. As a matter of common sense this is right in most of the cases in which doubt arises in practice, but if intended as a complete account of the matter it is very inadequate. "Evidence" consists, on the one hand, of certain matters of fact that are accepted as undebatable, and, on the other hand of certain principles by means of which inferences are drawn from the matters of fact. It is obvious that this process is unsatisfactory unless we know the matters of fact and the principles of inference not merely by means of evidence, for otherwise we become involved in a vicious circle or an endless regress. We must therefore concentrate our attention on the matters of fact and the principles of inference. We may then say that what is known consists, first, of certain matters of fact and certain principles of inference, neither of which stands in need of extraneous evidence, and secondly, of all that can be ascertained by applying the principles of inference to matters of fact.

No administrator waits until knowledge is available. As a result, "administration by belief" and "policy making by belief" is a very frequent and necessary event. The point of this description

is to acknowledge the importance for these two types of "knowing" to administrators and to suggest that evaluators can play an important role in the development of both types of human knowledge. There are a number of contributions made by the evaluation community to test the belief systems underlying administration and policy making, and I feel that this is important. For example, executive branch personnel often act on beliefs about the goals for programs which are not the same as those held by the legislative branch. The most complex condition is found when the executive, the legislative branch and the public all have different beliefs about the goals. Methods have been developed to get more achieved, at a minimum, awareness among different parties, or possibly even congruence among different parties. Another example are the techniques which have been developed to generate new beliefs. The Department of Health, Education and Welfare, under the leadership of Joseph Wholey attempted to systematically collect facts which would lead to new and competing beliefs as well as finding additional facts to support old beliefs. One example of what were called "service delivery assessments" was a study which looked at the services the United States was providing the Indochinese refugees. 5/ In this study, the belief that refugees are homogenous group was seriously challenged. The study identified, for the purpose of service delivery, quite distinctive groups of refugees. The first group was composed of active professionals who needed to have information, access to licenses and a limited amount of physical support to disappear into the American system. A second group had little going for them. They were

unskilled. They had major physical and/or mental handicaps. They were very limited participants in their own countries before becoming refugees in the United States. While the first group often had multilingual individuals, the individuals in this group were often illiterate in their home language. In between you had other groups. While these facts may have been related to the beliefs of those administrators close to the program, they have the potential of giving a department secretary or a congressional oversite committee a basis for questioning the appropriateness of service delivery strategies. For the administrator, it gives a chance to test the "common sense" and for the researcher, the service delivery assessment gives some clues to what is worth investigating and how to define variables.

Summary

The position being conveyed in this section is that belief is a very important basis for action. Techniques which improve the evidential basis for beliefs and result in the strengthening or the replacement of previously held beliefs, in turn provide the basis for improving services. If evaluation personnel want to be primarily involved with knowledge production, they will be only partially involved with policy making and administration. Knowledge production requires the correct question or issue and then a lot of time and skill. The correct question or issue can probably only be developed after a clash develops between competing and factually supported beliefs.

Federal Program Evaluation

The previous section suggested that some things seemed to be unlikely candidates for focal variables when documenting school improvement efforts from the federal perspective. The purpose of this section; risky as it is, is to list the questions which seem reasonable to address in federal studies or evaluation of school improvement efforts.

In 1977 I asked Dr. Mary Kennedy to develop the evaluation plan for the Education for All Handicapped Act. Policy makers had a large number of questions which needed to be examined; questions characterized by an extensive array of topics and topics characterized by changes which would occur overtime. The plan is remarkable because Dr. Kennedy achieved agreement on the questions and agreement that everything could not be studied by one method at one point in time. 6/

The type of questions which needed to be addressed in this study are listed in the following display. In a recent planning effort I found these questions to be useful in organizing an evaluation plan for a study of a Labor Department program; therefore, there may be some fairly standard questions which should be addressed from the federal perspective, across programs. However, this assertion needs much more testing.

The experience of developing this study plan causes me to greatly respect the following:

DISPLAY

A Full Scale Federal Program Evaluation Generally Requires:

I. Identifying the goals of Congress

A. Who are the intended beneficiaries?

B. What services are envisioned for these beneficiaries?

C. What administrative mechanisms did the Congress envision to provide services?

D. What positive impacts were expected? (What negative impacts were to be guarded against?)

II. Describing the executive branch's program

A. Who are the beneficiaries receiving services?

B. What array of services exist? What is the relative frequency of services?

C. What administrative actions has the executive branch taken? What administrative mechanisms are in place?

D. What impacts appear to be covered by or associated with the presence of these services?

III. Providing an analysis and syntheses of the data collected

A. Do the intended beneficiaries appear to be receiving services they might not have been otherwise receiving as a result of this program?

B. Do the services being received appear to be consistent with those envisioned in the Act?

C. Do the actions taken by the executive branch appear to be consistent with those expected by the Congress? (E.g., regulations, distribution of effort.)

D. Are the impacts identified related to the services provided and are these impacts consistent with the intent of the legislation.

IV. Providing recommendations

A. for the law

B. for the executive branch

C. for the local administration of services and/or federal funds.

(1) brokering of the questions.

The general question or the starting question always has a familar ring: Does it work? Is it successful? All of us have grown use to the difficult transition to the next questions envolved in defining "success" and "work". Sometimes we find difficulty in defining the "it" that is the intervention. Success usually has many faces in a social program. In order to gain the necessary political strength to get programs passed through the Congress, the purposes of any single program are usually fairly expansive. If one Member can see an opportunity to meet an objective or increasing employment with a program, this may provide a rationale for a vote. If another Member sees an opportunity to help rural districts with a program, the same program, this may provide another rationale for a vote. As a result, the success of any program is usually described along several different dimensions. The dimensions can even be conflicting or competing. The unlikely event is the program with a single purpose within a perspective much less a purpose that is common among perspectives. A bargain needs to be struck.

(2) Bargaining for time.

It is quite common to hear knowledgable people argue for more time before evaluations are initiated. If we have learned anything in the 60s and 70s, it is that time is required for implementing innovations (which seem to be complex, almost by definition). In the evaluation of EHA, data was produced for some questions,

immediately. Other questions needed to wait for investigation. The reasons for delay were based on the three major reasons:

1. No idea of what was worth being examined
2. No technology to examine what was worth examining
3. No reasonable expectation that what was to be examined was in place.

But no delay was argued for the evaluation. The bargain for time meant that some questions would be answered immediately.

(3) Initiating array of studies.

The program evaluation is not the same as a study or a contract. The program evaluation is many questions, and many studies using many methodologies. This is the only reasonable conclusion from experience with the Education for All Handicapped Act and from any more recent experience with the Labor Department program mentioned earlier. Currently, fifteen studies are included in the EHA evaluation. Data is collected at one point in time in some studies and over several years in others. Case studies are used as well as the national survey. Some data collections are made once, others are made at intervals over a period of years. These choices depend on the discrete questions.

4. Focusing on descriptive data.

The overwhelming experience in the EHA evaluation was the demand that policy makers and the public (and the courts) have for descriptive information. The questions related to who is out there and what services look like seem to be the central interest of federal administrators. This experience has been

replicated in a study of school systems currently supported by the National Institute of Evaluation. 7/

Summary

Whenever we are invited to document achieved improvement efforts in the future, I feel the style of the approach has been well documented by the experiences of the last decade. The brokering of questions, the use of several studies with different methodologies, the bargaining for time and the focusing on descriptive data we will illustrate the successful work of Paul Hill on the Title I evaluation and May Kennedy in the evaluation of EHA.

Gathering Data

Earlier I described the federal program as many studies designed to inform on a limited set of questions. This argues for a different strategy of sponsorship than is usually found to obtain field data. In the course of procuring the Follow Through evaluation, one contractor (SRI International) was asked to perform the entire effort, initially. Everything from planning to data collection, from analyzing data to reporting; from disseminating information to organizing constituents (both parents and academics); etc. This experience and others caused me to feel that it was physically and intellectually impossible for a single organization to organize and execute a major program evaluation. There are many reasons. The first regards people. How can any single organization capture enough talent to put, lets say, ten senior investigators on a single contract? In some areas we are fortunate to find

ten senior performers in the United States much less ten senior performers in one organization. But even if a number of performers are found in one setting a diversity of intellectual commitments is difficult to find. Even Universities which are supposed to be dedicated to diversity of ideas have departments which are known for a preponderance of advocates for a particular therapy or a particular school of economics or a particular pharmacological treatment strategy. The same situation exists in contract research firms. People who are very successful with particular techniques or strategies usually get a lot of business by clients needing those techniques. Recruitment becomes focused. Applicants who like a certain approach to things apply. The result is that it is usually difficult to find a group dedicated to survey techniques, for example, who have an equally strong group interested in rigorous case studies. I also suspect that the associated but quite different demands which such various groups would place on the management structure of an organization might be difficult or even unbearable.

As a result, when I hear that one RFP has been announced to evaluate a given program, I feel the policy maker will be poorly served. A single contract usually means a single contractor (Sub-contracts are usual but are generally used for highly specialized technical assistance as opposed to creating alternative or competing approaches to the overall task). The likelihood that a single source has the human resources available to conduct a major program evaluation strikes me as unlikely. If a contractor manages to corner this huge talent pool, the likelihood that they can be

managed, strikes me as unlikely. Hence, I feel that program evaluations are more serious if there are plans to utilize several different resources, each chosen because they can contribute uniquely to an aspect of the program being studied.

The second, and related, experience which I have had repeatedly is the evaluation of programs which is often based on obtaining data through a single investigatory strategy. I feel very nervous when a study is proposed which used a questionnaire, for example, to answer a large number of interesting and important questions. I have had two recent experiences where the methodology was selected and then marginal tinkering was performed to get this single basic vehicle to nibble at additional questions. My nervousness is becoming a reflex. Even though it takes more time, I feel that each question of interest for program evaluations must be treated as independent events and the best possible design created for the questions individually. If there is sufficient design and sample overlap to justify a marriage, I would rather make that decision as a result of seeing opportunities for collapsing individual studies into a single study rather than beginning with a single study and adding side interests. The first sympton of this disease is usually the comment: "Since we are going to go to all of these cities anyway, why don't we just add. . ."

The better strategy is well illustrated by the studies of the handicapped act and ESEA Title I. When the evaluation for the Education for All Handicapped Act was planned, Dr. Kennedy divided the study into seven basic questions. 8/ Individual

studies were planned to examine facets of each of the study questions over a five year period. As of January, 1981, 15 studies had been commissioned with 20 contractors. This also brings up another point. The federal officials envolved in evaluating the Education for All Handicapped Act, prepared an annual report which was a syntheses of all studies of interest to the date of the publication.

As a result, the burden which is often given to the individual report, the individual technical report, to serve as both a technical statement as well as a dissemination vehicle, was . It seems clear to me that both purposes are poorly served if one document is to speak both to the technical community and the political community. A similar strategy was pursued by Paul Hill in his major study of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Act. Dr. Hill commissioned studies with separate contractors. He was faced with a shorter time frame, years. However, the separate studies provided the cumulative evidence desired by the Congress in making its single largest education decision in the reauthorization of Title I in 1978.

Dissemination and Diffusion of Evaluation Research

We pride ourselves on being oriented to empirical evidence therefore, I am certain we will all accept the notion of finding that our technical reports are not good vehicles for communicating to the public or policy maker. However little discussion exists

on a reasonable alternative. The purpose of this section is to make one point about this situation.

As a person who has been a sponsor of evaluation and research efforts for nearly a decade, I am no longer concerned by a criticism that a report has too much technical information or language. In fact, the opposite would be more disturbing. If a study is done and results are reported which have too little technical information to allow either vicarious or actual replication, then there should be criticism. The point being that evaluation research reports should be technically competent and technically complete statements. The investigator has the professional obligation to represent the technical strategies employed in a study in the most acceptable and understandable fashion. The obligation is to deliver a technically understandable statement. Without such a statement, there is no starting point for the bureaucrat or the politician.

It seems reasonable that another vechicle needs to be developed for dissemination and diffusion to other audiences. In fact, several audiences might require several vehicles. The form and standards for reporting evaluation research are developed. Part of the emergence of a profession is usually hearlded by the acceptance of a series of rules or standards for performance. The content of reports is a well debated standard for scientific work. There is no reason why these standards should be changed. In fact I would argue for the opposite; for more enforcement of the standards of good scientific writing. The vehicles for other audiences are quite different. In both the evaluation of the Education

for All Handicapped Act and in the evaluation of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Act, synthesis reports were made from the commissioned literature for the Congress. The report prepared by Dr. Kennedy went beyond the commissioned studies and searched for relevant, "fugitive" studies. The demand for both of these synthesis documents went far beyond any demand ever received by these managers for the individual investigations; nonetheless, the individual investigations were fully available so that interpretations and statements could be challenged.

It is obviously not clear what makes the best dissemination vehicle for each necessary audience for evaluation reports. However, I feel that debating this question is more reasonable that attempting to add another reporting burden to the already difficult task of clearly representing what was done in a study for the technical communities.

It seems reasonable to assume that most of the questions we now have are difficult to inform with a single study. In fact, it seems a bit egotistical for an individual investigator to feel that his or her study should have the goal of clarifying all aspects of a major policy question. The more reasonable view is that the study is part of the cumulative process of assembling evidence. This, in turn, places the burden on a sponsor to come up with an evaluation plan, not a study. The Congress expected such a plan in both the Title I work and the Handicapped Act evaluation.

Fugitive Literature

There is one final note that I want to add here. When the sponsor is required to assemble studies, the opportunity and responsibility exists to examine the "fugitive" literature. The review of extant but unsponsored literature has tangible returns. Even if the "news" is negative, it is better to know the work. In the evaluation of EHA both Dr. Kennedy and I hoped to offer small contracts to the academic community to capture and report the unsponsored literature. We were unable to get such contracts established before leaving but the idea is important for the next generation of program evaluations and for the quality of the package of information prepared for th policy maker.

Follow Through

Our purpose in this session was to give philosophical, methodological and practical perspectives on the documentation of school efforts. As a result of the more general statements, the conference organizers next wanted us to turn our attention to the large and innovative Follow Through Program and reflect on the future of this program. This program has already accomplished many goals. This effort: (1) recruited [illegible] of the very talent performers from the early childhood field and diverted their attention to the K-3 school years; (2) provided visible demonstrations of excellent programming throughout the nation; (3) contributed to the literature on early school assessment; and (4) transferred parts of or the entire program to school systems throughout the country.

The Follow Through dilemma is obvious, what is next at this point in time. Obviously, I believe that demonstrations are potentially powerful vehicles to assist the state and local agencies to overcome widely encountered school problems. I also believe that program evaluations as similarly powerful tools to assist federal policy makers. As a practical matter, Follow Through should be analyzed from the standpoint that these perspectives provide quite different opportunities. For example, Follow Through is unique because it has a comprehensive mandate (health services are authorized as well as educational services). The Education for All Handicapped Act has a similar mandate. In administering EHA we pursued health services seriously and found out how little we knew about the trust funds (Title XIX and XX) and how little the schools understood about how to coordinate and use these funds or services. Follow Through may be uniquely suited to allow study of the nature of health and education service coordination for low income children. This is clearly an area where the federal executive and the Congress has need for more "true" beliefs and knowledge. Coordination of services is clearly a national problem. My choice would be to view each state as idiosyncratic and see the Follow Through project(s) within the state as examining the service opportunities for a given state service strategy. In pursuing such an issue, the study plan would need to be developed and numerous evaluation studies commissioned.

There are other national issues that are worth considering. For example, Follow Through represents a carefully designed set of intense training efforts. The National Science Foundation extensively documented its science training strategy in the 60s. The Teacher Corps and Teacher Centers represent another federal intervention and a fairly extensive literature accompanies these efforts. No attempt has been made to similarly document the Follow Through intervention much less to discuss in a comparative way, the federal efforts across these significant efforts.

Follow Through could also be refitted as a new demonstration vehicle. The materials developed by the Follow Through Sponsors and the philosophies espoused by the Sponsors have had a profound impact on the Nation's schools. There are few national conferences of education research or curriculum leaders that do not have either the original Follow Through Sponsors or the "children" presenting. Perhaps it is time to see the demonstrations opportunities for such a program in the later grades; the grades where comprehensive of words and numbers receives priority rather than the decoding of words and numbers; the grades where social and academic behavior extends to wider and more complex circles. The legislative authority may not exist for this redirection. However, my hopes for outcomes from more demonstration work at the early elementary grades seem marginal compared to what might be done for our oldest elementary school children.

While I do not see an obvious possibility for a new national evaluation, Follow Through has generated extensive evaluation literature over the past decade. Only a part of this literature

was federally initiated. An enormous fugitive literature exists. Neither the executive nor the Congress has been well served by this literature. I feel an effort to bring this literature together around major national problem or around major federal issue areas should be considered. These should be separate statements. Neither purpose has begun to exhaust this literature.

Follow Through's future is a questionmark. On the one hand you have a significant program which provided opportunities to address federal and national issues. On the other hand, the executive branch attempted to cut the program in the budgets of 1975, 76, 77 and the program was saved by communities which, understandably, want and can use the extra resources. The articulation of the federal issues toward which this program is addressed or the national problems toward which the program is addressed needs to be accomplished. If the program serves neither purpose, the research and demonstration communities should be graceful in acknowledging the situation. But the Follow Through program should not disappear without a standing ovation to the people who accomplished so much.