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The problem of this study was to analyze some of the effects of selected Title III, Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), Projects to Advance Creativity in Education (PACE) projects on the educational processes in Texas. This study includes a review of literature relating to federal aid to education, but gives specific attention to the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Title III of ESEA is given special attention and its progress through congress is delineated. In addition to this, the study was discussed with Title III staff members of the Texas Education Agency (TEA), and the TEA Title III records relating to the eighteen selected projects were investigated for supplementary and background data.

The personal interview technique was utilized to secure data on the operation of the Title III programs in the eighteen selected Texas school districts. The interview guide was validated by a panel of experts recommended by the
Deputy Commissioner of Education at the TEA. The project schools were chosen because they composed all PACE programs in Texas that were in operation for the maximum of three years that Title III allows, and were planned and operated throughout the project's existence by independent school districts. All of the eighteen project directors of the selected projects were interviewed. The data presented represent their combined perceptions concerning the past and residual status of the three year PACE programs. The project schools' daily attendance varied from an average of 212 students to a high of 208,800 and these independent school districts are widely distributed throughout the state.

The introduction and the statement of the problem and purposes are presented in Chapter I, the review of literature and supplemental data in Chapter II, the collection of data in Chapter III, the findings in Chapter IV, and the summary, conclusions, and recommendations in Chapter V.

To carry out the purposes of this study, the interview questions were placed into eight categories. These categories were project planning, project activities, project finance, project personnel, non-public school involvement, project dissemination, project evaluation, and miscellaneous questions.
Conclusions

The following generalizations about the selected PACE programs are inferred:

(1) Federal funds that represent general aid to education are effective in stimulating educational innovation and exemplary programs in Texas.

(2) Title III funds and the subsequent activities have demonstrated their power as district-wide change agents.

(3) There were many unanticipated benefits generated outside the projects' stated objectives.

(4) Independent school districts have demonstrated that innovative ideas will be integrated into their program with local funding if they prove worthwhile.

(5) Problems with the appointment and turnover of personnel formed a major impediment to all phases of the PACE program.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are based upon the findings and conclusions of this study:

(1) With evidence of adequate project performance, budgets should have automatic fund increases to accommodate normal salary increases, and to offset normal inflation, without loss of services.
(2) All projects should be required to appoint, for at least one-half time, a person to plan and conduct effective dissemination of the project's concept and activities.

(3) Third party evaluations should be mandatory, with the team of evaluators selected by the Texas Education Agency and/or United States Office of Education from a national roster of experts.

(4) Where appropriate needs have been identified for a PACE program, a three- to six-month planning grant should be required and funded.
A HISTORICAL STUDY OF SELECTED TITLE III,
ELEMENTARY SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT
OF 1965, PACE PROJECTS IN TEXAS

DISSERTATION

Presented to the Graduate Council of the
North Texas State University in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

By

Crandall J. Young, B.S., M.Ed.
Denton, Texas
December, 1971
## TABLE OF CONTENTS

**LIST OF TABLES** ............................................................. v

**Chapter**

I. **INTRODUCTION** ...................................................... 1

- Statement of the Problem
- Purposes of the Study
- Background and Significance of the Study
- Questions for Which Answers Will be Sought
- Definition of Terms
- Limitations
- Basic Assumptions
- The Interview Guide
- Procedures for Collecting Data
- Procedures for Analysis of Data
- Summary

II. **A REVIEW OF LITERATURE AND SUPPLEMENTAL DATA.** ...... 18

- The Historical Background of Federal Aid to Education
- The Background of ESEA of 1965
- Legislative and Political Background of Title III, ESEA
- Summary

III. **COLLECTION OF DATA** ............................................. 43

- Development of the Initial Interview Guide
- Selection of the Panel of Experts
- Construction of the Interview Guide
- Identification of PACE Projects to be Analyzed
- Letter to the Superintendents of Selected Projects
- The Interviews
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IV. PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Texas Education Agency File Data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Response to the Interview Questions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIBLIOGRAPHY</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LIST OF TABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td>Major Description of the Selected PACE Projects</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>Types of Activity in Selected PACE Projects</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>Latest Per Pupil Average Daily Expenditure in Project LEA's</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.</td>
<td>Total Title III, ESEA Funds Allocated to Selected PACE Projects</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.</td>
<td>Persons Served by the Selected PACE Projects</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.</td>
<td>Selected PACE Project Participants by Race</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.</td>
<td>Percentage Distribution of Rural/Urban Participants in Selected PACE Projects</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII.</td>
<td>Percentage of Expenditures of Selected PACE Projects by Expenditure Account</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX.</td>
<td>Persons Initiating Proposal Idea of Selected PACE Projects</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X.</td>
<td>Persons Composing Planning Team of Selected PACE Projects</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI.</td>
<td>Community Organizations Assisting in the Planning of Selected PACE Projects</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII.</td>
<td>Areas of Quantitative Gain in Selected PACE Projects</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII.</td>
<td>Areas of Qualitative Gain in Selected PACE Projects</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIV.</td>
<td>Receptiveness of Principals, Supervisors and Teachers to School District's PACE Project</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XV.</td>
<td>Areas of Accomplishment Outside the Selected PACE Projects' Objectives</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVI.</td>
<td>Dominant Factors Impeding Successful Operation of Selected PACE Projects</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVII.</td>
<td>Percentage Band of Integration of PACE Project Activities into School Districts' Program</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVIII.</td>
<td>Categories of Instructional Materials Produced by Selected PACE Projects</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIX.</td>
<td>Visitor Effects on Select PACE Project Activities</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX.</td>
<td>The Degree of Sufficiency of Select PACE Project Funding</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXI.</td>
<td>Sources of Funds to Finance PACE Activities after Stoppage of Title III Funds</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXII.</td>
<td>Percentage of Total Title III, PACE Funds Expended for Personnel Training, Dissemination, Evaluation and Consultants</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXIII.</td>
<td>Personnel Employed by Project Year</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXIV.</td>
<td>Location of Project Professionals Prior to PACE Appointment</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# LIST OF TABLES--Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XXV.</td>
<td>The Types of Dissemination Techniques and the Per Cent of Utilization</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXVI.</td>
<td>Dissemination Procedures Utilized by Project Visitors to Learn of PACE Program Existence</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXVII.</td>
<td>Visitors to the Selected PACE Projects Categorized by County, Region, State, Out of State and Foreign Country</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXVIII.</td>
<td>Strengths of Selected PACE Projects by Category</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXIX.</td>
<td>Weaknesses of Selected PACE Projects by Category</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXX.</td>
<td>Rating Scale for Fulfillment of PACE Projects' Stated Objectives</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXXI.</td>
<td>Frequency of Evaluation Techniques Utilized in the Selected PACE Projects</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXXII.</td>
<td>Evaluation Procedures by Category for Selected PACE Projects</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXXIII.</td>
<td>Effects Scale of Transfer of Title III Control from USOE to TEA</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXXIV.</td>
<td>Research and Analyses Conducted Concerning Selected PACE Projects.</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXXV.</td>
<td>Responses to Questions Concerning Suggested Changes in Specific Areas of Title III</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

With the signing of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, federal dollars became a prime factor in the schools of America (6, pp. 90-91). Among the titles of this act was Title III, which concerned itself with promoting the utilization of new knowledge and techniques in the schools, and encouraged creative attempts to improve educational practices in local situations (2). These projects, known as Projects to Advance creativity in Education (PACE), were to be designed and implemented to result in either the actual introduction of a specific improvement or in the demonstration of an innovative or exemplary program (8).

In Texas, priority in funding was given to those projects which offer the greatest promise of solving persistent educational problems. Therefore the basic purpose of the Title III program in the state was to stimulate the development and utilization of new, improved solutions to old educational problems (9, pp. 110-114).

Underlying this priority are nine areas of concern that should be included in innovative and exemplary programs in Texas. These concerns are
Comprehensive pupil appraisal
Educationally disadvantaged students
Early childhood education
Language skills development
Adult basic education
School manpower development
Vocational education
Individualized instruction
Handicapped children, youth, and adults (9, p. 2)

In addition to this, the Texas State Advisory Council for Title III has identified, with assistance from the Texas Education Agency Office of Planning, nine critical educational needs to provide a structure for meeting the identified priority areas of concern in the most effective and efficient manner. With no priority meant in the listed order, they are

1. Providing educational services within a region
2. Enriching the school's instructional program
3. Strengthening the school's special programs and supporting services
4. Demonstrating extensions of the regular school program
5. Demonstrating innovative organizational patterns and arrangements
6. Identifying new content and converting it for use in the classroom
7. Demonstrating effective staff development services
8. Strengthening instruction through the development and utilization of unique instructional materials
9. Encouraging creativity among teachers and school staffs (9, pp. 69-72)

Since 1965, when the program began, 196 proposals have been received and 108 grants have been awarded by the Texas Education Agency, or the United States Office of Education.
Eighteen of these grants were for projects that were funded for the maximum three-year limit that Public Law 89-10 allowed. The total allotment to Texas in the years 1966 through 1970, inclusive, has been approximately $35,000,000 (9, p. 1).

Benson and Guthrie stress the importance of Title III:

As we see it, the strength of Title III lies in its ability to stimulate local initiative and innovation. Inevitable as our nation becomes more crowded and educational methodology becomes more complex, we are seeing a tendency to concentrate decision making at higher governmental levels. It is important to have a vehicle under which the reservoir of local initiative can continue to be tapped and replenished. New ideas and good ideas do rise to the surface in local school districts. More importantly, in the essential area of development, it is at the level of local school districts that significant adoption and adoption must take place. As education becomes more centralized and mechanized, this source of new ideas and this level of development must not be ignored. Title III funds are a reward and stimulation for locally generated activities. They must continue to represent the incentive link between higher governmental agencies and local initiative (1, p. 49).

It is assumed that these projects have had an effect on Texas education. However, no detailed study has been conducted to determine their real contribution. Such a study will be most helpful in structuring these projects as they endeavor to complement and enhance education in Texas.
Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study is to analyze some of the effects of selected ESEA, Title III, PACE projects on the educational processes in Texas.

Purposes of the Study

The purposes of the study are (1) to report the past and residual effects of the eighteen selected, three year Title III PACE projects in Texas, (2) to formulate generalizations about these PACE projects and (3) to make recommendations for improvement of Texas education through the future use of these funds.

Background and Significance of the Study

Over the last decade the federal government has dramatically and unmistakably reversed a one-hundred-and-seventy-year-old policy by proclaiming, in a series of laws, its intention to share responsibility for local education, both private and public. The climactic announcement came on April 11, 1965, in the form of a billion-dollar package labeled Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA) (3, p. 305). School districts that were once fearful of federal aid began to take advantage of this new source of revenue. Some enterprising school and state officials began
to enjoy unaccustomed freedom made possible by federal funds, to initiate new programs, conduct research and to foster experiments in areas long neglected at the local and state levels of education because of a lack of trial-error experimental funds (7, p. 90).

PACE is designed to stimulate and assist local education agencies to meet vital needs of education by

1. Encouraging flexibility, innovation and experimentation throughout our educational system
2. Providing better services than are now available
3. Supplementing existing educational programs and facilities (5, pp. 41-43)

Any project is eligible for these trial-error funds as long as it facilitates the role of Title III in its innovation. It is required that the program of the project supplement local, area, or state funding rather than supplant it (14, p. 7). An applicant, to be eligible to submit a project proposal, must be a local education agency. Such a local education agency, or a combination of them, is under the administrative control of a local board of education or another legally constituted public authority that directs or performs a service function for public elementary or secondary schools (15, pp. 1-7).

A quite different requirement is found in Title III guidelines. The guidelines call for the involvement and
participation of persons that are representative of the cultural and educational resources in the project area, both in the planning and conducting of project activities (16, p. 1). The prime educational resource is the Local Education Agency's (LEA) teachers and other professional personnel who will be affected by and through the project. For innovation to be effective, the stimulation must come from within. This is possible when school personnel are partners in all facets of the change process. Other cultural and additional educational resources such as institutions of higher education, non-profit private schools, educational laboratories, libraries, museums, private foundations, private industry, and community action agencies are to be involved when it is deemed appropriate. In this way the wider use of community, educational and cultural talent, and resources is assured (10).

This act emphasizes a more adequate use of technology and points toward new and better utilization of human resources in the demonstration of promising solutions to educational problems, rather than by the acquisition of hardware (15, p. 10).

Because the intent of PACE was to stimulate and assist in support of innovative and exemplary programs, it was required that LEA's specify methods to finance the project
activities as federal support was phased out. This phase-out of federal funds is essential in order to conserve federal resources for other promising PACE programs (10, p. 9).

The project period was for a total time of three years, for which a project may be supported with PACE funds. Thus, if a project is approved for a planning grant for one year, the subsequent years of support can be no more than two for operational activities. The subsequent years' funds are not allocated automatically, but are awarded on the basis of a request for a continuation grant. The allocation of funds for project continuation is contingent upon satisfactory progress toward the achievement of project goals (15; 16, p. 1).

The PACE manuals stress that project proposals should contain provisions that will accommodate school children in the geographical area who attend nonprofit private schools, if their needs can be met by the project activities. Non-profit school students and their teachers should benefit from the program by participating, observing, visiting and/or disseminating of the project's information. However, this involvement should be determined by the project and individuals involved and not the private institution (14, p. 15).

This involvement of nonprofit private schools' children and teachers should be in the planning and development phases of the project. Local education agencies are directed to
Involve, where appropriate, representatives of private schools in the planning phase of the project as "cultural and educational resources" of the community. In operational programs, many different types of arrangements might be made. For example, dual enrollment programs, mobile units, visiting personnel, after-school activities, central libraries or museums could provide opportunities to children in nonprofit private schools and their teachers. In such programs, the local educational agency will prevent the separation of participating children by school enrollment or religious affiliation. Title III instructors or personnel conducting a project on private school premises may bring with them such "tools of their trade" as may be required to conduct the project provided such "tools" can be carried on and off the private school premises at the beginning and close of each day. Federal funds must not be used for religious worship or sectarian instruction (13, p. 15).

The act further states that nothing in it shall be construed to authorize or allow the payment of costs for religious worship or instruction (10). It also states, in section 604, that nothing contained in the act authorizes any department, agency, officer or employee of the United States to direct or control, in any fashion, a school or educational institution's curriculum, instruction, administration, personnel, or instructional materials (11, pp. 505-515).

Within these constraints in the act, it is hoped that LEA's will be encouraged to exercise local ingenuity and take a bold new look at their educational needs and consequently take advantage of these trial-error funds to develop programs
which illustrate innovative ideas as well as enrich the curriculum (16, pp. 1-4).

In developing creative projects that will complement the objectives of the PACE program, schools must engage in the varied phase of the innovation process. In this context, projects may be developed which (1) invent a creative solution to a problem or (2) demonstrate an exemplary program to local requirements and organize its incorporation into the educational program (14, p. 1). It is likely that many projects will combine these approaches.

The innovation process delineated in the PACE manual is as follows:

Inquiry.---Knowledge from basic research is formulated into ideas and theories that can be used in inventing solutions to educational problems. Thus, it provides the intellectual raw material from which improvements can be invented.

Invention.---Applicable theory and research results are engineered into improvements that can be introduced in schools. The invention stage includes the design of an innovation and its refinement, including feasibility testing. Finally, these improvements are arranged into an organized program which can be demonstrated.

Demonstration.---Improvements which have been engineered and tested in the invention stage are illustrated as working models that can be emulated and adapted. The demonstration stage creates widespread awareness of useful innovations. It enables educators to examine the feasibility of innovations, to understand the factors affecting their use, and to consider their adaptation to other settings.
Adaptation.--Innovations that have been demonstrated in exemplary programs are adapted to local situations. The adaptation stage promotes the widespread acceptance and appeal of an innovation and encourages its adjustment to the unique requirements of particular situations (15, p. 1-2).

The Texas State Plan for Administration of Title III states:

After approximately three years of involvement in the Title III program of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Projects to Advance Creativity in Education, the State educational agency accepts the objectives, the innovative process and the areas for emphasis as described in "A Manual for Project Applicants and Grantees" dated May, 1967, as the foundation for the Administration of a State Plan for Title III (9, p. 73).

Consequently, Texas PACE projects conform to the federal guidelines and their programs are indicative of this influence and thrust. What the Texas programs have achieved is not so readily ascertained!

There have been numerous articles in educational journals and a number of doctoral studies, such as James W. Guthrie's "The 1965 ESEA: The National Politics of Educational Reform" (4) and Anthony John Polemeni's, "A Study of Title III Projects, ESEA of 1965, After the Approved Funding Periods" (6), plus a number of PACE publications (12), all written about Title III projects with a national perspective. None are available concerning the State of Texas.
The effects of ESEA Title III funds on Texas education have been a subject of much discussion. This study will be helpful in assisting local, regional, and state officials as they guide and restructure future programs with Title III funds.

Questions For Which Answers Were Sought

To carry out the purposes of this study, answers were sought concerning each of the project's

(1) Planning
(2) Activities
(3) Finance
(4) Personnel
(5) Non-Public School Involvement
(6) Dissemination Procedures
(7) Evaluation
(8) Any other pertinent data that cannot be categorized

Definition of Terms

For the purposes of this study the following definitions have been formulated:


TEA--The Texas Education Agency (state department of education).

Title III--Refers to Sections 301 through 308 of Public Law 89-10, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended.

PACE--Projects to Advance Creativity in Education, an acronym for the Title III program of ESEA.

Guidelines--Interpretations of program policies produced by USOE for Title III of ESEA.

Proposal--An application for funds to the USOE describing the proposed Title III project.

Project--A Title III grant following a proposal to the USOE for the planning or implementation of educational services to persons in a school and/or school system.

LEA--Local Education Agency, a public body having local autonomy in conducting educational programs for the youth and certain adults in that community. Used interchangeably with "school system" and "school district."

Innovation--A new or improved educational idea, practice or technique. "New" is defined as new to the user and/or the geographical area of Texas.
Evaluation--The process of determining the extent to which an activity has accomplished its objectives and goals.

Limitations

This study was limited to the analysis of the eighteen Title III, ESEA, PACE projects that were planned, funded, administered, and operated by an Independent School District in Texas (Appendix A).

Basic Assumptions

It was assumed that the educators would respond honestly to the questions of the interviewer.

The Interview Guide

The questions contained in the interview guide were formulated and submitted to five educators who have been actively involved with Title III projects. These five educators were selected from a list of twelve educators compiled by Dr. Marlin Brockett, Deputy Commissioner of Education, Texas Education Agency, Austin, Texas. Utilizing the expertise of this panel, the final questions for the guide were checked for clarity, applicability and appropriateness. It was felt that this would lend reliability and validity to the study.
Procedures for Collecting Data

A review of project proposals, applications for project continuation, and evaluations, that are on file at the Texas Education Agency, revealed the broad and specific goals and accomplishments of the Texas PACE projects. (Appendix B, J, and K)

The answers to the interview guide questions were recorded in an interview with each superintendent or project director of the eighteen PACE projects in Texas that meet the stated requirements.

The information derived from the interview provides data on the superintendent's or project director's observations as to the effectiveness of the Title III PACE project to change, influence, and enhance some of the educational programs in Texas.

Procedures for Analysis of Data

The data obtained from the interviews and extracted from the Texas Education Agency records are reported in appropriate tables, when it is possible. Where it is beneficial, percentages have been calculated for added emphasis.

From the data collected, some of the effects of these eighteen PACE projects are drawn. In addition to this,
generalizations about the projects, recommendations for future use of Title III funds, and the organization of projects have been derived.

Summary

Chapter I has as its purpose the introduction and statement of the problem of this study. The background and significance of the study has attempted to show the need and timeliness of the study. The lack of any analysis at the state level has been noted.

The latter sections of Chapter I have briefly outlined the procedures followed in completing this study. The details of the procedures are reported in Chapter III. Chapter IV consists of the findings of the study. The summary, generalizations, and recommendations are presented in Chapter V.
CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY


CHAPTER II

A REVIEW OF LITERATURE AND SUPPLEMENTAL DATA

The review of literature and supplemental data was done prior to the development of the Title III, ESEA, PACE interview guide in order to provide the background information necessary for the study. The materials reviewed include books, articles, public documents, unpublished dissertations, and Texas Education Agency publications.

The material derived will be presented in the following sequence: (1) the historical background of federal aid to education, (2) the background of ESEA of 1965, and (3) the historical and political background of Title III, ESEA.

The Historical Background of Federal Aid to Education

At the beginning of the nineteenth century, the idea of supporting a public school system at public expense was not an entirely new idea. However, the fulfillment of this idea had not been realized in any country in the world. By the end of the century the United States had taken the idea and pushed it nearer fruition. This was not accomplished
without many bitter struggles and controversies, and federal aid had deep involvement in both (6, p. 10).

National assistance to education, in one form or another, is about as old as the United States constitution. Since our country's beginning, there has existed a blending of local, state, and federal responsibility for education, in an atmosphere of cooperation. According to Eidenberg and Morey, there are some fifteen acts of Congress that reflect the beginning of federal aid under the Articles of Confederation. This document specified that every sixteenth section of land be set aside, in each township, for educational purposes, under the provision of Ordinances of 1785 and 1787. In later years in the West, where land values were low, schools received two, and even more sections, for every fifteen sections in the township (7, p. 30).

Higher education was provided important federal assistance with passage of the Morill Act of 1862. This act allocated large amounts of public land to the various states for establishment of agriculture and mechanical colleges. These institutions were known as "land grant colleges" and the original act has been renewed and broadened to purvey annual grants to sixty-seven colleges and universities (6, p. 16).
in secondary schools for agriculture, home economics, trade, and industrial subjects. These funds were increased in 1929 by the George-Reed Act, and again in 1936 by the George-Deen Act, which extended the instructional areas into the distributive or selling occupations at the secondary school level. Within the past two decades these acts have been further expanded to furnish additional teacher salaries, and to buy equipment and construct buildings on a one-federal-dollar-per-one-local dollar, matching fund basis.

The Lanham Act allocated funds to schools for the construction of buildings, their maintenance and operation, when these needs were created by the movement of military personnel and defense workers into a community. In 1950 this act became Public Law 815 and Public Law 874, commonly called impacted area school aid, and it continues to provide funds for school construction throughout the states. Another unprecedented form of educational aid was the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, which is known as the G.I. Bill of Rights. This act provided veterans with funds for subsistence, as well as tuition (6, p. 16). In the 1950's, a number of bills were passed to meet critical educational demands, such as the National Foundation Act of 1950, the Cooperative Research Act of 1954, and the National Defense Act of 1958.
The latter act was a result of the Russian earth satellite "Sputnik" stimulus, and provided funds to strengthen science and mathematics teaching in elementary and secondary schools. This act also authorized government loans to college students. Furthermore, it became the accepted practice for colleges and universities to construct facilities using federal aid. Many of the same universities received federal funds for carrying out contract research for government agencies (1, p. 20).

Eidenberg and Morey point out that rapid student gains and increased fiscal needs became very evident nationwide in the 1950's. In the 1800's, most of the nation's schools were privately owned, but by 1900 over 90 per cent of the schools had become public systems. The enrollment level was at twenty-three million in 1945 and had grown to over fifty-one million in 1963. Overall school enrollments have increased 44 per cent since 1954 and school expenditures have skyrocketed to an increase of 77 per cent. These factors have increased pressure upon congressmen to heighten the federal government spending level for education (7, pp. 10-16).

Between the years 1950 and 1965, secondary school enrollment doubled. This, along with the knowledge explosion, created a multitude of demands that descended on public schools that possessed inadequate facilities, personnel, and fiscal
resources. According to Bailey and Mosher, the school systems were generally overcrowded, old, and dilapidated, with needs that far exceeded the revenue (1, pp. 4-11). Pressures for additional federal aid were produced by wide inequities between district's and state's resources. State classroom expenditures varied from 3,645 dollars per unit to 12,215 dollars per unit. The causation of this wealth inequity can be mainly attributed to variances of wealth distribution, legal restrictions of fund access, and the level of local aspiration (1, p. 14).

In spite of these needs, federal aid was not appearing on the scene with any degree of rapidity. Munger and Fenno state that the most controversial issues of federal aid have been race, aid to parochial schools, and federal control (14, p. 19). Bailey and Mosher point out that all general aid bills introduced in congressional sessions during the late 1940's and the 1950's succumbed to the three "r's" of race, religion, and reds (federal control) (1, p. 18).

There were many outside pressure groups opposed to federal aid. Eidenberg and Morey state that notable among these were the United States Chamber of Commerce, National Association of Manufacturers, Southern States Industrial Council, National Economic Council, American Farm Bureau
Federation, National Conference of State Taxpayers Association, and Daughters of the American Revolution (1, p. 16; 7, p. 13). Many of these argued that Congress would control the policies if they controlled the purse strings. The most prominent anti-federal aid block was composed of Chairman Howard Smith, ranking Democrat William Colmer, and the Republican members of the House Rules Committee. This committee was the principal impediment to federal aid from 1955 to 1964 (1, pp. 23-24).

The church-state issue of federal aid was always present. Bailey and Mosher point out that sectarian schools have derived federal funds from College Housing Loans, National School Lunch Act, and the National Science Foundation. Many persons felt that the tax-exempt status of parochial and non-profit private schools had in reality been an acceptance of federal aid for generations (1, p. 35). Procedures to solve the church-state problem did not seem impossible. However, because of political expediency, the solutions were not forthcoming in the days that John F. Kennedy occupied the White House.

With this dichotomy concerning federal aid, an atmosphere for compromise was created. Certain changes in 1964 opened legislative doors that had been locked since our country's beginning. However, to change the modus operandi of Congress
in any environment is most difficult. It is generally considered easier to expand programs that have already withstood their initial tests successfully. For this reason, the new legislative proposals affecting education were written to complement the War on Poverty program (7, p. 51).

The Background of ESEA of 1965

In its original form, the ESEA was a broad spectrum legislative package that had two major educational emphases (1) Equality and (2) Quality. Title I of the original act, was addressed to the improvement of the educational services to the thousands of children that are from economically deprived families. Title II authorized federal dollars for instructional materials and equipment. Title V was designed to assist in the improvement of state educational agencies in their efforts to serve more efficiently at the federal, state, and local levels of public education. These three titles represent the "equality" facet of the educational opportunities of ESEA of 1965 (3, p. 305).

The emphasis on "quality" is couched in Titles III and IV of the act. Title IV's purpose was planned for long range gains through educational research and developmental activities. The effects of these efforts could conceivably not be felt
for five or even ten years. Because of this, the improvements in the quality of United States education in the near future were focused on Title III of ESEA (9, p. 11).

In spite of the fact that Title I was granted 1.01 billion dollars for the economically deprived youth, to a great extent it was Title III and its 100 million dollar allocation for supplementary services and supplementary centers that broke free the political log-jam that had traditionally stopped the flow of federal dollars to support elementary and secondary education (10, p. 305). This was due, in part, to the private and parochial school's idea that through supplemental services and supplemental centers could come large federal allocations for their pupils (13, p. 16).

The fact that ESEA of 1965 was involved in a legislative log-jam was no surprise. Bills that call for greater use of federal funds at the state level, as well as the local level, have always been controversial and hotly contested. Bennion has emphasized that many more bills have been brought forth and debated than have become law (2, p. 5). Kearns calls Congress the past political graveyard for education bills (13, p. 17).

In the case of ESEA of 1965, it appeared that the past cleavages that had separated general education support had
been closed. Underneath this placid atmosphere remained the wounds from years of conflict and struggle. No one was sure to what extent these wounds would be reopened, and in the process undermine the delicate compromises. In the past, there had seemed to be solid support for federal aid, but it had been torn asunder by a hurricane of maneuvers designed to bludgeon certain bills. These maneuvers are the well practiced tools of the legislative process and when they are properly utilized, they can block a bill's movement at any one of the many stages required for enactment (13, p. 17).

The reappearance of opponents of federal aid armed with a contentious attitude about race, religion, or federal control can signify the demise of an education bill. Typical of this opposition toward passage of federal aid legislation is the statement about public funds for parochial schools by Senator Donnell of Missouri, during a senate debate concerning general aid to education in 1948.

It is of fundamental importance—and I emphasize fundamental importance—that public funds be not appropriated for the use or benefit of sectarian schools . . . . It is to the interest of both the public and of the religious groups themselves by which the respected sectarian schools are operated that such schools should not be supported either in whole or in part by public funds . . . . First, such support would permit public funds derived from people of all religious beliefs—yes, and perchance from people of no religious beliefs—to be used for teaching of religious views held by
specific groups of individuals . . . . The support of sectarian schools by public funds would result in a situation of this kind: If one specific sect should receive and use such public funds, obviously other groups would be entitled to the use of public funds in their schools . . . . There is the danger, and very real danger--that the Government which provides funds will ultimately, even though it does not do so at the outset, attach conditions to the use of such funds. The Government will thereby interfere in the policies of the schools. Such use of public money . . . tends, and strongly tends, to strike down what Thomas Jefferson termed the "wall of separation between church and state" (5. p. 20).

The 1954 ruling by the Supreme Court in the Brown v. Board of Education case made school desegregation an issue in any general education aid. Following this decision, almost every bill that was introduced was confronted with an amendment by a civil rights advocate, such as Adam C. Powell, that would exclude federal dollars from any and all segregated schools (10, p. 16). In this area, a clear dichotomy developed that resulted in "general school aid" legislation not being passed. With the passing of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 came a special implication for education. This Act added presidential and congressional authority to the Supreme Court mandate of 1954, and at the same time removed the desegregation amendment tool that had so effectively blocked federal aid to schools (1, pp. 30-31).

This civil rights change, and the 1964 Democratic landslide, that wiped out many of the opponents of federal
aid, created an environment that was conducive to compromise and consensus. Also present was a master tactician, President Lyndon B. Johnson, who could make the utmost use of these factors (10, p. 32). Utilizing this most opportune setting, Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 was approved by the Congress, thus reversing a twenty-five year trend of federal aid to education being allocated for only critical educational needs.

On April 11, 1965, President Johnson signed the bill into law. The signing took place in front of a one-room schoolhouse in Stonewall, Texas where the president had begun his schooling. At the signing, the President stated that ESEA of 1965 (P.L. 89-10) represented "a major new commitment of the Federal Government to quality and equality in the schooling we offer our young people (6, p. 45)."

Legislative and Political Background of Title III, ESEA

In late January and early February of 1965, the Senate (16) and House (26) hearings on the proposed ESEA of 1965 were held. In these hearings, Anthony J. Celebrezze, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, indicated that Title III "would enrich the programs of local elementary and secondary schools and encourage cooperative efforts among public and
private schools (26, pp. 67-71)." Francis Keppel, then Commissioner of Education, commented on the various kinds of services that would be possible, and emphasized Title III's potency for "innovation and experimentation (16, pp. 850-852)."

There were other comments about the constitutionality of supplemental centers and the fact that these centers, would parallel and perhaps usurp the functions of state educational agencies. Basically, the opponents of Title III focused on two major aspects of the Title. The first was the usual church-state argument concerning the provisions for inclusion of non-public schools, and second, concern about the elimination of any state control for Title III programs, with the implication being the start of "a federal system of education (13, pp. 17-20)."

After the Senate and House hearings, the Senate published a report summarizing the purpose of each Title of ESEA. The points made in reference to Title III were as follows

1. Responsibility for initiating and operating school programs rests with the state and local authorities.
2. Nothing in the Title is designed to enable local public educational agencies to provide services and programs which will inure to the enrichment of any private institution.
3. In all cases, payments will be made only to legally constituted public agencies (17, pp. 1001-1011).
House Hearings, 1966 (25)

The Subcommittee on Education held hearings during March, 1966. The approval of 217 projects was announced approximately two months prior to this by the Commissioner. Being cognizant of this, the Congressmen asked few questions concerning the PACE projects' effectiveness. During these meetings, amendments were made that authorized $175 million for fiscal year 1967, and $500 million for fiscal year 1968 (18). This was necessary because the original law allocated $100 million for only the first year. Many witnesses expressed strongly their preference for state administration of the Title (25).

Senate Hearings, 1966 (28)

These hearings were held in April, 1966 and were quite lengthy. However, most of the 2,575 page report was concerned with Title I and its special incentive grant provision. The full text of PACEsetters in Innovation was placed in the record, as well as the USOE rebuttals to the issue of state control for Title III (28). In response, the USOE contended that the law, in its present form, was working reasonably well, and assured that no innovations were being duplicated, which would not be the case if state control was in effect (19).
House Hearings, 1967 (24)

The entire Committee on Education and Labor sat for the 1967 ESEA amendments. Commissioner of Education, Harold Howe II, was questioned quite thoroughly by Congresswoman Green and Congressman Quie concerning the federal role in Title III. They also confronted the Commissioner with information that indicated a number of States with "informal" state plans possessed superior PACE projects. It became apparent in this hearing that Title III was soon to be under state administration (24).

Senate Hearings, 1967 (20)

These hearings brought forth no additional information that was not presented in the House hearings. Senator Ralph Yarborough defended federal administration of Title III, while Congressman Quie presented his arguments for state administration, following the passage of his amendments in the House (4). It did appear that Senate support for USOE administration of Title III was stronger than that found in the House (20).

House Hearings, 1969 (26)

With the election of a Republican President, these hearings took on a tempo that involved the policies of the new administration. With the Republicans favoring a two-year
program extension and the Democrats a five-year extension, a controversy of some significance developed.

A trend toward the "consolidation" of several state plans was pushed by Health, Education, and Welfare Secretary Finch. It was evident that Finch had correctly interpreted the thrust of Title III. In his testimony he said:

> These PACE projects were intended to provide new innovative thrusts into the educational process, with successes to become models for general application. The purpose is critically important; after three years and one administrative turn (from local to predominately state control,) I doubt that we can truly measure Title III's impact. I think that the program should definitely be continued, with a special eye, however, to retaining the 'model building' emphasis. Once a model has been shaped and perfected, its future funding should not constitute a drain on Title III's seed money (26, p. 2804).

Congressman Brademas placed in the Record his speech of January 28, 1969, to the Middle Atlantic Dissemination Conference. In this speech, he reminded State officials that Title III was "designed to fill the need for stimulating imaginative, creative, and better ways of educating children (26, p. 2806)." The Record indicates the passing of the Consolidation Act on April 23, 1969, by the House (26).

The purpose of Title III is stated in Section 301 of ESEA as follows:

> For the purpose of enabling the Commissioner, through grants for supplementary educational centers and services, to stimulate and assist in the provision
of vitally needed educational services not available in sufficient quantity or quality in elementary and secondary schools and in the development and establishment of exemplary elementary and secondary educational school programs to serve as models for regular programs . . . . (21, p. 401).

As is indicated in the law, the writers hoped that these centers and services would serve as models and demonstrate the feasibility of research results and new educational ideas to schools in their areas. In this way, Title III funds could be brought to bear on the numerous, old educational problems that need solutions. The goal of educational improvement toward excellence, in the mandate, provoked little comment. However, the means to achieve this objective caused Title III to be pulled along a number of politically rocky paths (9, p. 15). The formula for allocation of funds to each state, according to the number of children of school age and the total state population, guaranteed each state an equitable share of the funds. The overall administration of the program initially remained at the Federal Government level (3).

There were two primary reasons for choosing federal over state control:

First, it was thought that state educational agencies were ill equipped, because of a weak leadership tradition and a shortage of qualified personnel, to administer a large new program embodying relatively
radical concepts of educational quality and innovation. Moreover, there was a fear that state agencies would succumb to pressures from the many local school personnel they serve and consequently would disperse Title III funds in a thin 'veneer' over a wide number of projects and school districts. Such a distribution pattern, though it perhaps would be politically popular, would jeopardize the desired massing or clustering of resources thought necessary to achieve improvements in quality.

A second reason for choosing federal administration was the thought that a unitary decision-making authority would have greater perspective in judging which of numerous proposed projects would have national and regional significance. Moreover, it was hoped that centralized decision making would reduce excessive duplication of 'pilot' operations and 'risk' capital projects involving similar ideas (3, p. 12).

As was alluded to in the hearing synopsis, the proponents of state administration, persistent and loud, made their ideas known. They based their feelings for state administration on four points:

Essentially, they are (1) constitutionally speaking, education is generally conceded to be a state responsibility primarily, and thus state educational agencies were the logical administrators. (2) State educational agencies were more knowledgeable than USOE regarding the needs of local school districts and thus were in a better position to make decisions concerning where and how the money should be invested. (3) States could communicate with local educational agencies more directly and rapidly and would avoid much of the delay and 'red tape' which allegedly would surround the USOE administration. (4) ESEA Title V funds would supply states with the resources they needed to assume the leadership responsibilities inherent in administering Title III (3, p. 12).

After the original passage of ESEA, the advocates of state administration continued their opposition with amendments
to the original Act. Until December of 1967, the battle raged back and forth between the two groups. At that time, both the Senate and the House approved the "Green Amendments" (named for Edith Green, Congresswoman--their major sponsor) which as of July, 1968 would place Title III administration in the hands of the state education agencies (9, p. 53). On that date, the states assumed responsibility for one of the major research and developmental efforts in the history of education in America.

In testimony, before the House of Representatives in 1965, Commissioner of Education, Francis Keppel, cited three additional facets of Title III beyond "supplementary services" and a "higher quality of education." He said that Title III is "to insure that flexibility, innovation, and experimentation become an integral part of our educational system" (23, p. 94). With this in mind, the Commissioner ordered a revision of the Title III guidelines, placing the emphasis on "innovations," and not on "supplemental centers and services." It was after this that the acronym for Title III, highlighting innovation, Projects to Advance Creativity in Education (PACE) was agreed upon (21, pp. 3-4).

Commissioner Keppel placed administration of Title III under the Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education. This
was precipitated when a split in the "Ink Committee," appointed by President Johnson to revitalize the USOE for administration of ESEA, could not resolve the question of its placement (21, p. 22). And it was the direct responsibility of the Division of Plans and Supplemental Centers to review and recommend approval of the proposals, with the various geographic regions of the United States being served by an administrative unit called an "Area Desk" (3, p. 14). As the model for the change process in the development of the Title III role concept, Egon Guba's paradigm was chosen. This paradigm was also utilized in the setting of priorities for project approval (11, pp. 136-153). With this foundation, the guidelines, A Manual for Project Applicants, was written to emphasize that the objectives of Title III are to encourage and demonstrate educational innovations, as well as to supplement existing programs and facilities (27, p. 1).

Proposals seeking funding under Title III began arriving in Washington in the autumn of 1965. These proposals were evaluated by personnel in the USOE and by professional educators outside the Office of Education (3, p. 14). In spite of the fact that innovation had been stressed in the guidelines, it appeared to those rating the proposals that little true "innovativeness" was present. An article in

Everett M. Rogers, working with the USOE, defined an innovation as "an idea perceived as new by the individual" (15, p. 13). This definition had the effect of moving Title III away from the "research, inquiry or invention" mode, in evidence in Guba's model. However, Guba maintained that "the purpose of diffusion activities is to create an awareness and understanding of an invention and to provide opportunity for its assessment (11, p. 147)." He also noted that this diffusion responsibility for Title III projects should be placed on the shoulders of the individual grantee (25, p. 148).

The following excerpt is indicative of congressional concerns expressed about innovation:

Some concern has been expressed that the standard used by the Office of Education for deciding whether an application embodied an 'innovative' approach has been too rigid and unrealistic. The committee understands that, if an idea, practice, or technique was in use in one part of the country it was not 'innovative' in another area of the country. If this is the case, the standard is not in accord with congressional intent . . . . For the purpose of Title III, the term 'innovation' is defined as the adoption of new or improved educational ideas, practices, or techniques. This definition will not support setting a nationwide standard. A new or improved approach in one area may not be new or improved in another area (8, p. 28).
This concept obviously caused the Office of Education to re-consider their definition of "innovation." After several weeks of discussion, the view espoused by Commissioner Harold Howe II that "few really new ideas come along during one generation, and that the definition of innovation should be relative," was accepted (8, p. 181). Following this thinking, innovation was defined to mean: new for the state or geographic region in which the applicant was located (12, p. 5). Thus the stage was set for Title III of ESEA and the guidelines were drawn. Those guidelines, first printed in 1966, and revised in May, 1967, were called A Manual for Project Applicants and Grantees (27) and reflected the national priorities which were (1) improving educational opportunities, (2) planning for metropolitan areas, (3) meeting the needs of rural communities, and (4) coordinating all community resources (27, p. 2).

Summary

A review of the literature relating to ESEA of 1965 revealed that it was Title III that broke free the political log-jams that had traditionally stopped passage of acts to support elementary and secondary education. The fact that nonpublic schools could benefit from Title III funds seemed to eliminate the issue of religious discrimination. Too,
the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 removed the "desegregate or no federal funds" amendment threat that had long stymied federal aid to schools. These two factors, along with the Democratic landslide, created a legislative environment that was conducive to the passage of educational legislation that was general in nature, and not meant for only critical education needs.

It appears that Commissioners Howe and Keppel, Secretaries Celebrezze and Finch had clearly defined the role of Title III. In spite of their explanations in Senate and House hearings, much Congressional concern was expressed about innovation, with its definition finally being, "educational activities new to the state or geographic region where the grantee was located." Reflecting the goal of innovativeness, the Title III programs were identified with the acronym PACE, meaning Projects to Advance Creativity in Education.

Following three years of continuous and fervent effort by the opponents of the federal administration of Title III, control was transferred to the states in July, 1968. With this transference, the states accepted the responsibility for one of the major research and development programs in the history of American education.


CHAPTER III

COLLECTION OF DATA

The problem of this study was to analyze some of the effects of selected Title III, ESEA, PACE projects on the educational processes in Texas. The following procedures were implemented to obtain the appropriate data: (1) development of initial interview guide, (2) selection of panel of experts to review the interview guide for clarity, applicability, and appropriateness, (3) construction of final interview guide, (4) identification of PACE projects to be analyzed, (5) formulation of letter to the superintendents of the selected PACE projects requesting permission to interview the project director, and (6) the interviews.

Development of the Initial Interview Guide

Following a review of literature, a review of USOE Title III materials, review of applications for Title III PACE grant proposals, proposals for Title III PACE continuation grants, U.S. Congress records, and PACE evaluations at the TEA, tentative broad areas and questions were identified.

To assist in the structure and organization of the questions into a workable interview guide, professional
research-survey companies and their personnel were contacted for materials and suggestions. These companies were Belden and Associates Research of Dallas and Mexico City (1) and Marketing Product Facts Research of Dallas (3). Utilizing these personal contacts and Parten's *Surveys, Polls and Samples* (4), Rosenberg's *Logic of Survey Analysis* (5), Young's *Scientific Social Surveys and Research* (7), and Kahn and Cannel's *Dynamics of Interviewing* (2), the initial interview guide was formulated for submission to the panel of experts (Appendix C).

**Selection of the Panel of Experts**

The panel of experts was chosen from a list of twelve educators who have knowledge and experience in the Texas Title III program. The list of twelve educators, from which the panel of five experts was chosen, was compiled by Dr. Marlin Brockett, Deputy Commissioner of Education at the Texas Education Agency. Dr. Brockett was Assistant Commissioner for Regional Education Services (Title III, ESEA funds) prior to his recent appointment to the Deputy Commissioner position. From his thorough and extensive involvement with Title III, he, probably better than anyone in the state, could identify the experts in this area (Appendix D).
The five panel members selected to assist were an assistant director of an education service center, a former TEA director of Title III, a member of the State Advisory Council for Title III, a former Associate Commissioner of Planning at the TEA, and a former education service center director (Appendix E and F).

Each of the selected prospective panel of experts was contacted in a telephone or personal conversation and asked to review the initial interview guide to determine its clarity, applicability, and appropriateness. All the selected persons agreed to serve on the panel (Appendix G).

Construction of the Interview Guide

Using the responses of the panel of experts, the final draft of the interview guide was formulated. All questions in the original interview guide were judged to be pertinent with the exception of a question in part VII concerning project evaluation. The panel indicated that the various project objectives are found in the TEA records in a more comprehensive form than could be derived in an interview. Therefore, that question was deleted. Upon the recommendation of the panel of experts, several questions were rephrased to clarify their meaning, with the use of a scale of answers.
suggested on a number of questions. Only one item was added, that being in part VII, miscellaneous questions, number 3, where the role of the State Advisory Council for Title III was applied (Appendix H).

Identification of PACE Projects to Be Analyzed

In order to maintain a manageable sample of the PACE projects funded in Texas, certain criteria for selection were experimented with to determine the projects to be analyzed. After examining numerous combinations, the following selection criterions were decided upon (1) projects funded to an independent school district, and (2) projects administered and operated by an independent school district, and (3) projects administered and operated by an independent school district for the maximum of three years allowed in Title III legislation.

These criteria offered a sample of eighteen projects that were widely geographically distributed over the state with a desirable average daily attendance range from 212 to 208,800 pupils, which includes all classifications of schools (Appendix A).

Letter to the Superintendents of Selected Projects

Following the selection of the projects to be studied, letters were sent to the superintendents of the independent
school districts requesting permission to interview the project directors (Appendix I). Postcards contained in the letters were received from 13 of the chosen project districts' superintendents. The five superintendents that did not respond by returning the cards were contacted by telephone and agreed that the project director could be interviewed. This assured that 100 per cent of the perceptions of all eighteen selected PACE projects could be recorded for study.

The Interviews

The interviews were conducted with the project directors, using the finalized interview guide. Each question was asked the interviewee as it was stated in the interview guide. If further clarification was needed, a typical and consistent example was used in each interview. In the scale-type answer found in certain questions, the categories were given to the person being interviewed. Where open-ended questions were asked, the probing technique was utilized where it was deemed appropriate. All project directors were interviewed in their offices and responded to all questions in the interview guide.

To build rapport with the person being interviewed, a few general questions were asked concerning their school
district. Also, a brief description of this study was presented prior to the interview questions. The interviews lasted from a minimum of one hour to a maximum of one and one-half hours. During the interview, each project director displayed friendliness, cooperation, and apparent openness in answering the interview guide questions.
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CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS

The findings presented here are the summation of data derived from the Texas Education Agency files, and the perceptions of the individual PACE directors recorded in a personal interview with each of the eighteen project directors. The data from the Texas Education Agency files are mainly objective and quantitative, while the director's remarks are, in the main, subjective opinions based on their recall with an occasional reference to records in their possession.

Summary of Texas Education Agency File Data

As is shown in Table I, the projects fall into one of three categories under their major description. None of the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Project</th>
<th>Total Projects by Category</th>
<th>Percentage of Project Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Innovative</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptive</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
eighteen selected projects were adaptive and it was found that 39 per cent were innovative and 61 per cent were exemplary programs. This means that the majority of the projects were designed to demonstrate an exemplary program to local requirements and to organize its incorporation into the independent school district's program. It was the intent of 39 per cent of the projects to install an idea that was educationally new to their school district and surrounding area.

Table II shows the types of activities that the projects utilized. None of the projects spent any activity time in

### TABLE II

**TYPES OF ACTIVITY IN SELECTED PACE PROJECTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Activity</th>
<th>Total Project Activity by Category</th>
<th>Percentage of Project Activities by Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning of Program</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning of Construction</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducting Pilot Activities</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation of Program</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remodeling</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the planning of construction or in actual construction. Twelve per cent spent project activity time planning the program while 49 per cent of the project activity time was for operation of the program. Fourteen per cent of the project activities involved remodeling and the remaining 25 per cent was spent in conducting pilot activities.

The review of project applications indicated that the eighteen projects being studied had served geographic areas having an estimated population of 11,707,583 persons. These persons resided in a total of 528 counties that contained 2,317 local education agencies that were served through these PACE programs. The average latest per pupil average daily attendance expenditure for the local education agencies was 435 dollars per student. The range in dollars spent annually began at 238 dollars and ran up to a high of 504 dollars. This indicates a wide cross section of poor and rich local education agencies among the selected programs, as shown in Table III.

Table IV shows the number of dollars granted to and expended in the eighteen projects being considered. The project's cost ranged from a low of 64,704 dollars to a high of 678,411 dollars for a three-year program. The total dollar expenditure for all eighteen PACE projects was 4,970,167
### TABLE III

**LATEST PER PUPIL AVERAGE DAILY EXPENDITURE IN PROJECT LEA'S**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Average Daily Expenditure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project 1</td>
<td>$482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 2</td>
<td>$416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 3</td>
<td>$238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 4</td>
<td>$358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 5</td>
<td>$445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 6</td>
<td>$425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 7</td>
<td>$498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 8</td>
<td>$486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 9</td>
<td>$490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 10</td>
<td>$464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 11</td>
<td>$472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 12</td>
<td>$370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 13</td>
<td>$461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 14</td>
<td>$404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 15</td>
<td>$420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 16</td>
<td>$458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 17</td>
<td>$504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 18</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Average</td>
<td>$435</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*State School—not available

### TABLE IV

**TOTAL TITLE III, ESEA FUNDS ALLOCATED TO SELECTED PACE PROJECTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Amount Allocated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project 1</td>
<td>$178,971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 2</td>
<td>$212,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 3</td>
<td>$231,053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 4</td>
<td>$177,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 5</td>
<td>$304,304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 6</td>
<td>$181,511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 7</td>
<td>$64,704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 8</td>
<td>$367,890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 9</td>
<td>$340,258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 10</td>
<td>$420,237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 11</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 12</td>
<td>$388,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 13</td>
<td>$471,217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 14</td>
<td>$604,411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 15</td>
<td>$299,957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 16</td>
<td>$155,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 17</td>
<td>$147,019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 18</td>
<td>$251,423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$4,970,167</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
dollars. This represents about one-fifth of all PACE, Title III dollars used in the State of Texas from 1966 to 1970.

The figures reported in Table V reveal a total population of 790,319 students and staff members served by the projects' activities. Of this group, 84 per cent of the persons served were public school students and 2.1 per cent public school staffs. Thirteen per cent non-public students were served and .7 per cent non-public school staff members were involved. Only .2 per cent of the total group were non-enrolled students, either school age or adult. In the area of project activities for staff members, 96 per cent of the professional persons served were public school personnel while only 4 per cent private and/or parochial personnel were served.

As shown in Table VI, the participants served in the eighteen projects were 84 per cent in the white race category and 12 per cent Negro. Other non-whites amounted to 1.5 per cent of the total and 2.5 per cent of those served were American Indians. This can be attributed to the fact that two projects had geographic coverage into New Mexico where the Indian population is dense.
TABLE V

PERSONS SERVED BY THE SELECTED PACE PROJECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Public School</th>
<th>Non-public School</th>
<th>Non-enrolled</th>
<th>Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 1</td>
<td>190,465</td>
<td>65,200</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 2</td>
<td>6,801</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 3</td>
<td>26,594</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 4</td>
<td>1,003</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 5</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 6</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 7</td>
<td>1,729</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 8</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>1,382</td>
<td>7,231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 9</td>
<td>1,095</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 10</td>
<td>82,705</td>
<td>10,500</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 11</td>
<td>2,388</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 12</td>
<td>1,020</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 13</td>
<td>103,400</td>
<td>1,135</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>4,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 14</td>
<td>12,700</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>2,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 15</td>
<td>174,576</td>
<td>21,168</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 16</td>
<td>57,000</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 17</td>
<td>4,692</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 18</td>
<td>1,255</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>668,713</td>
<td>103,032</td>
<td>1,392</td>
<td>16,631</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage of Persons Served

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public School</th>
<th>Non-public School</th>
<th>Non-enrolled</th>
<th>Of Total Staff Served</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>84%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>.2%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage of Total Staff Served

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Non-public</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>96%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE VI

SELECTED PACE PROJECT PARTICIPANTS BY RACE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project no.</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Negro</th>
<th>American Indian</th>
<th>Non-white</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>139,675</td>
<td>19,500</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>5,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>24,528</td>
<td>2,133</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>997</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>786</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>153,182</td>
<td>21,329</td>
<td>15,512</td>
<td>3,878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1,275</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1,133</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>83,855</td>
<td>20,680</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>103,000</td>
<td>5,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>24,640</td>
<td>3,360</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>3,792</td>
<td>815</td>
<td></td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1,080</td>
<td>175</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>538,161</td>
<td>73,467</td>
<td>16,137</td>
<td>9,261</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Percentage by race | 84% | 12% | 2.5% | 1.5% |

*Not available
The rural/urban distribution of project activities, shown in Table VII, indicates that the largest percentage, 40 per cent of those served, were in the central cities, while 24 per cent were non-central city. Only 12 per cent of the participants were from farms, and the remaining percentages were 11 and 13 per cent, respectively, for non-farm and other urban area persons served.

Compilations of proposed and amended budgets of the eighteen selected PACE projects over the three year periods revealed the percentages of funds expended in the various expenditure accounts, as shown in Table VIII. By far the largest preponderance of funds was spent in the instructional classifications with an expenditure of 67.93 per cent. On the opposite extreme, no Title III funds were spent on Attendance, Health, or Student Body Activities. The other expenditure accounts of major importance were the administrative category, with 16.48 per cent expended, and capital outlay, with expenditures of 8.22 per cent. Fixed charges, operation of the plant, and maintenance of the plant were in the 1 to 3 per cent range with food service, community services, remodeling, and transportation falling below the 1 per cent expenditure level.
### TABLE VII

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF RURAL/URBAN PARTICIPANTS IN SELECTED PACE PROJECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Farm</th>
<th>Non-Farm</th>
<th>Central City</th>
<th>Non-Central City</th>
<th>Other Urban</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Category Percentage | 12% | 11% | 40% | 24% | 13% |

*State school--not applicable*
### TABLE VIII

PERCENTAGE OF EXPENDITURES OF SELECTED PACE PROJECTS BY EXPENDITURE ACCOUNT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure Account</th>
<th>Expenditure Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>16.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>67.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil Transportation</td>
<td>0.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation of Plant</td>
<td>1.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of Plant</td>
<td>1.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Charges</td>
<td>2.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Services</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Body Activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Services</td>
<td>0.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remodeling</td>
<td>0.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Outlay (Equipment only)</td>
<td>8.33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of the Response to the Interview Questions

As mentioned in Chapter III, all of the eighteen selected PACE project directors were personally interviewed. Each project director was asked each question contained in the interview guide with the answers recorded in written form.
The questions asked were grouped into eight categories as follows: (1) Project Planning, (2) Project Activities, (3) Project Finance, (4) Project Personnel, (5) Non-public School Involvement in Project, (6) Project Dissemination, (7) Project Evaluation, and (8) Miscellaneous Questions about the Project.

**Project Planning**

**Question 1:** Who initiated the idea and/or proposal for your school district's project?

As shown in Table IX, forty per cent of the time persons in the independent school district's central staff initiated the idea for the project, twenty-six percent of the time the idea came from the superintendent of schools, while the idea had its start 15 per cent of the time with a consultant outside the district. The remaining categories were, 4 per

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiating Person or Agency</th>
<th>Percentage of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent(s)</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom teacher</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Administration</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant outside district</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEA request</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USOE request</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
cent by a principal, 4 per cent by a teacher and likewise 4 per cent because of a request by the Texas Education Agency. Seven per cent of the projects were initiated because of a United States Office of Education request.

Question 2: What persons composed the planning team for the project (numbers)?

As shown in Table X, fifteen of the eighteen projects used college or university education consultants, and thirteen of the eighteen planned with central administrators on the team. Ten of the projects utilized the superintendent and teachers at the planning level, while only six projects used

TABLE X

PERSONS COMPOSING PLANNING TEAM
OF SELECTED PACE PROJECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Team Member Categories</th>
<th>Number of Responses in Each Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Administrators</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Consultants</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay Persons</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Board Members</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEA personnel</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-public school personnel</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural organization personnel</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Service Center personnel</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Planning Company</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Agency personnel</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
principals and cultural organizations personnel in the planning phase. Five projects used Texas Education Agency personnel and four involved lay persons in the community. Two projects had school board members on the planning team, but only one project of the eighteen (not necessarily the same one) used students, parents, Education Service Center personnel, community agency personnel, non-public school personnel, or a commercial planning company in the planning functions.

Question 3: What relationships were utilized or established with other community organizations or institutions due to the planning and implementation of this project?

As shown in Table XI, seven of the eighteen projects did not establish or use relations with community organizations.

TABLE XI
COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS ASSISTING IN THE PLANNING OF SELECTED PACE PROJECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Number of Responses per Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Force personnel</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional laboratories</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symphonic association</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-public schools</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleges and Universities</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural organizations</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of these</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
or institutions in the planning of the project. Of the remaining eleven, six projects used local business relationships, five used contacts with private and parochial schools, four involved museums and/or art galleries, and three resourced colleges and universities. One project utilized relations with the Symphony Association, another an Air Force Base, and a third utilized the Regional Educational Laboratories in Austin, Texas and Albuquerque, New Mexico. Seven projects involved no community business or agency.

**Question 4:** What in retrospect, would you do differently should you plan another Title III project?

There were eighteen answers given to this question. These answers were reduced to concise terms and categorized into seven statements, indicating commonality in the problems of planning for a PACE program. The seven statements are

1. Do not use a commercial planning firm.

2. Involve all principals, and a good cross section of teachers.

3. Involve parents and community in planning with project staff to avoid a hurriedly written proposal that is highly theoretical and "get-dollars" oriented.

5. *Program Evaluation Review Technique (PERT)* the entire project from concept until federal funds phase out (for replication as well as planning).
6. Involve in-depth, LEA personnel in project area.

7. Plan at the sociological level of target population to be served.

Project Activities

Question 1: What quantitative changes in your school resulted from the Title III project?

Table XII shows the categories of quantitative gains that were realized through the projects and the frequencies of the various responses. The data reveals that the independent school district's in-service programs were the main area of improvement, with a frequency of eight, followed by the creation or acquisition of instructional materials,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA OF QUANTITATIVE GAIN IN SELECTED PACE PROJECTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area of Gain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement of in-service program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional materials created and/or acquired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased budgets for instructional media and materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement of students' social and academic skills and self concept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement and broadening of student services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
improvement of the students' self concept, and academic and social skills, with frequencies of five each. Four project directors indicated that the project had broadened and improved their district's student services, and one felt that the project had stimulated budget increases for instructional materials and media.

**Question 2:** What qualitative changes are in evidence in your school program because of the Title III project?

As shown in Table XIII, project directors felt that there were qualitative changes in their independent school districts because of the PACE program. Eleven of them indicated changes in the instructional philosophy of the district, and eleven, though not necessarily the same eleven, felt that the project had caused changes in student attitudes about school and learning. Additionally, six directors perceived that the curriculum of their district had been improved through the project, and six felt that the project had enhanced greatly the preservice and inservice programs in the geographic area served by the project. Indicative of this area influence was the opinion of four project directors that cooperation had been stimulated between independent school districts and other community institutions and agencies because of, and through, project activities. One
project director mentioned that his district's project had served as a change agent on a district-wide basis.

TABLE XIII
AREAS OF QUALITATIVE GAIN IN SELECTED PACE PROJECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Gain</th>
<th>Number of Responses per Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Changed in instructional philosophy of school district</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved school district curriculum</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altered student attitudes about school and learning</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced pre-service and in-service effectiveness in project's geographic area</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Served as change agent for entire school district</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulated school district cooperation with other LEA's and community agencies</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 3: How receptive were (1) principals, (2) supervisors, (3) teachers, to the project's existence and its contributions to the district's overall program? What caused this attitude in your opinion?

As shown in Table XIV, only six per cent of the independent school districts' principals received the project poorly.

Fifty-five per cent were moderately receptive and 33 per cent
were highly receptive to its presence. The independent school districts' supervisors were seventeen per cent moderately receptive while 83 per cent were highly receptive, to the project.

TABLE XIV

RECEPTIVENESS OF PRINCIPALS, SUPERVISORS, AND TEACHERS TO SCHOOL DISTRICT'S PACE PROJECT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Receptivity Scale</th>
<th>Per Cent Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>Poorly</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderately</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highly</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>Poorly</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderately</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highly</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Poorly</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderately</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highly</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eighty-nine percent of the districts' teachers were highly receptive, while 11 per cent were moderately receptive. Generally speaking, no teachers or supervisors were poor in their reception to the project's concept and activities.

Some of the reasons given for poor or moderate receptiveness were
1. Near retirement age and things are fine as they are; don't "rock the boat."

2. Felt infringement of project on their own school and/or classroom.

3. Project requires too much time and effort to implement.

4. Professional jealousy on the part of those not selected to participate in project directly.

5. Not enough involvement with project planning.

6. Compulsory use of project materials.

The reasons stated for high receptiveness were

1. Receptiveness increased outside project's independent school district.

2. All professional staff involved in the planning and identification of student needs.

3. Staff not threatened by project because of total involvement.

4. The instructional impact at classroom level caused voluntary participation.

5. Project developed good image in the diffusion of its concept and activities.

**Question 4:** What was accomplished by the project outside of its stated objectives that was important?
Table XV shows the categories of influence that came about in an ancillary fashion to the project. The effect most frequently brought forth was the fact that the project concept had become the heart of the district's instructional program, and had carried over into other academic areas outside the original area, as is shown with a frequency of eleven. It was interesting to note that these projects had stimulated interest in the school at the parent and community level, and had also influenced the school staff toward professional growth, with frequencies of nine and six.

TABLE XV

AREAS OF ACCOMPLISHMENT OUTSIDE THE SELECTED PACE PROJECTS' OBJECTIVES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Accomplishment</th>
<th>Number of Category Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project concept became the heart of instructional program and carried into all academic areas</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulated staff professional growth</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulated parent and community interest in schools</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilization of concept in college and university preservice programs</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A direct effect on students that was not anticipated</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-classifiable</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
respectively. The direct effect on students touched by the project was relatively high, with a frequency of eight, and perhaps more important, was the student effect at the preservice level in project area colleges and universities. This preservice aspect has many long range implications not anticipated from PACE programs for improvement of Texas education.

**Question 5:** What factors were most dominant in impeding, or at least complicating, the successful operation of the project?

As shown in Table XVI, a number of things caused problems in the activities of PACE programs. Twenty-eight per cent of the projects most dominant difficulty was with project personnel. Next, in descending order, were communications with the professional staff, at twenty-one per cent; budgetary difficulties, with 14 per cent; problems with equipment quality and material utilization, with ten per cent; and complications with facilities, transportation to the project, and scheduling time to conduct the projects activities, each with a percentage of seven. At the three per cent level were the problems of replacing a community agency's functions and dealing with resistance to change.
### TABLE XVI

**DOMINANT FACTORS IMPEDING SUCCESSFUL OPERATION OF SELECTED PACE PROJECTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impeding Factors</th>
<th>Per Cent of Responses Per Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resistant attitude to change</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment quality and materials</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budgetary</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation to project</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacing community agency</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling time to conduct project activities</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications with professional staff</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 6:** What project activities have been integrated into your school district program because of the project's influence?

The data presented in Table XVII reports the integration level of project activities into the independent school districts' overall program. Nine districts, or one-half of the projects in the study, indicated a high integration rate, with six districts absorbing the concept into their program at a moderate level. At a rather minimal level, two districts
accepted the project's concept, and in one district it was not permitted to spread at all.

TABLE XVII

PERCENTAGE BAND OF INTEGRATION OF PACE PROJECT ACTIVITIES INTO SCHOOL DISTRICTS' PROGRAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage Band</th>
<th>Number of Responses Per Band</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>67 per cent to 100 per cent</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 per cent to 66 per cent</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 per cent to 32 per cent</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zero per cent</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indicative of the highest integration level of category one are the comments, "The whole concept has been accepted district wide and a bond issue passed for funds to buy materials, equipment, and build facilities to accommodate the activities," "the project changed our elementary level instructional concept from the school board on down, and has been totally absorbed." Category number two is typified by the statement, "the concept continues in the project school and is being phased into the elementary schools at the rate of two per year, and will be implemented in the new high school opening in 1972-'73." Category number three is reflected in the comment, "the tutor program is continuing
on a limited, voluntary basis since the loss of federal support." The cause of no district wide integration of the concept is shown in the statement, "the administration has placed no emphasis upon the project's concept and success, and it does not receive obvious notice because of the isolation of the project school."

**Question 7:** What important instructional materials have been produced by this project?

Table XVIII conveys categories of the various instructional materials produced through the eighteen selected PACE programs. The table reveals that eleven projects developed some type or form of instructional units with appropriate instructional media to enhance the units utilization. Four projects created video tapes, four projects produced manuals

**Table XVIII**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Material Produced</th>
<th>Number of Responses per Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Video tapes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixteen millimeter films</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher and student units with prescribed media</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional manuals</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio-carrel with fast response to 1200 subject titles</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
for professional staff utilization, and four projects created 16 millimeter films for inservice and/or instructional use. Only one project constructed a piece of hardware, that being an audio-carrel with fast response to 1200 subject titles of varied information.

Question 8: What effect did the interruption by, and exposure to visitors have on the project's program?

The data presented in Table XIX reveals that visitors to the eighteen PACE programs had little effect on the project's operational activities. Twenty-eight per cent of the project directors indicated a very slight effect, while 72 per cent expressed the opinion that the visitors had no effect on the program at all. The great or moderate effect on the scale received no responses.

The slight-effect responses were probably companions of comments such as "visitors tried to sell us their ideas," and "visitors tied up quite a bit of the administrator's time." On the other hand, such comments as "the staff enjoyed visitors; they kept them on their toes"; "visitors made our work easier"; "we limited the use of flashbulb pictures, but felt visitors complemented the project environment," are indicative of the reception most visitors received in their on-site observations. Several project directors mentioned that the professional staff would express concern
when the visitor pace slackened, and would admonish him to secure some visitors as soon as possible. These visitors were no doubt considered to be an integral part of the program by the professionals involved.

### TABLE XIX

**VISITOR EFFECTS ON SELECT PACE PROJECT ACTIVITIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect Scale</th>
<th>Per Cent of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Great</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slight</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 9:** What in retrospect, would you do differently in structuring project activities?

This question elicited a number of varied comments that would improve future projects. Placed in concise form, and grouped, these suggestions are

1. Specify times for workshops prior to project initiation to delineate program methodology and professional staffs' schedules.

2. Broaden and amplify the project's concept within the home independent school district and the project area with information and involvement of professional personnel.
3. Emphasize quality of service and not just the quantity.

4. Make an extended effort to maintain project staff continuity.

5. Use Regional Education Service Centers for diffusion of project activities.

6. Make the project director's responsibilities strictly administrative.

Project Finance

Question 1: How adequate were the allocated Title III funds for accomplishing the project's objectives?

The project directors, overall, felt that the Title III funds were adequate to carry out the project's objectives as indicated in Table XX. Fifty per cent of the directors said

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Sufficiency</th>
<th>Per Cent of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
that their funds were excellent, and an additional 39 per cent said they were good. The lowest used response on the scale identified the funding level as fair, but no interviewee stated that the funds were poor or inadequate.

**Question 2:** If the project's activities are continuing since Federal support has ceased, what is the source of the funds?

As is shown in Table XXI, there are six categories of fund sources for project activities since federal aid has stopped. In 41 per cent of the eighteen selected projects, local funds are being used to replace federal dollars, followed by state funds at a 26 per cent level. The data revealed that federal funds other than Title III were being

**TABLE XXI**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund Source</th>
<th>Per Cent of Responses by Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local funds</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State funds</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New federal grant</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other federal funds</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fee from other Education Service Centers</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With unpaid volunteers</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
used to supplant or complement state and local funds where the PACE activities were continuing at a high level. Funds at the three per cent level are being generated by a new federal grant, fees from another education service center region, and with unpaid volunteers.

**Question 3:** What percentage, approximately, of the total three year funds were spent for (1) personnel training, (2) dissemination, (3) evaluation, (4) outside consultants.

Table XXII reveals the approximate percentages of funds expended for project personnel training, dissemination, evaluation, and consultants from the total Title III funds allocated to the eighteen selected projects. It is noted that the range for personnel training is from zero per cent up to a high of 55 per cent. In the dissemination category, the percentages vary from zero per cent up to 19 per cent. The expenditure range for evaluation is from zero to nine per cent. The cost for consultants outside the district begins at zero per cent and topped out at 15 per cent. These are broad ranges, and represent a good deal of difference in a project's priorities.

Overall, the total average per cent spent for personnel training was 16 per cent; for dissemination, 4 per cent; evaluation, 3 per cent; and for outside consultants, 4 per cent. These
four categories required a total of 27 per cent of the eighteen projects' budgets.

TABLE XXII

PERCENTAGES OF TOTAL TITLE III, PACE FUNDS EXPENDED FOR PERSONNEL TRAINING, DISSEMINATION, EVALUATION AND CONSULTANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Personnel Training</th>
<th>Dissemination</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Outside Consultants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Total services on contract basis

Question 4: What in retrospect, would you do differently should you seek funding of another Title III project?
The project directors felt that there were some things that they would change in the finance area of Title III projects. These ideas, placed in concise terms with no order of importance indicated are

1. Coordinate dollars spent in Title III with other compatible programs in the project area that are using federal funding.

2. Allocate more funds for equipment to improve the quality of materials and service rendered.

3. Begin a 33 per cent phase-out of federal funds after second operational year, down to no funding.

4. Assure funding level of increased funds during the second and third operational years to train new staff members appointed, because of personnel turnover.

5. Have a built-in percentage increase to offset personnel salary increases and overall dollar loss to inflation.

Project Personnel

Question 1: By the year, how many professional persons and non-professional persons were employed by the project?

Table XXIII shows the number of persons employed in the eighteen selected projects over the three year operational period. The table shows that 89 professional personnel were employed the first year, 87 the second year, and 80
### TABLE XXIII

PERSONNEL EMPLOYED BY PROJECT YEAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Year</th>
<th>Professional</th>
<th>Non-Professional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 year total</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>574</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

the third year for a total of 256 persons over the three year period. Under non-professional personnel 109, 102, and 107 persons were employed in the first, second, and third years, totaling 318 for the three year period. In all, 574 persons were employed by the eighteen PACE projects. There appeared to be a diminishing trend from the first to the third year professional personnel. In the main, this can be attributed to the reduction of funds as the project progressed toward its final year of operation.

**Question 2:** Where were the project personnel employed prior to their project appointment?

Information concerning where project professional personnel were employed prior to project appointment is reported in
Table XXIV. The data indicates that 83 per cent of the professional personnel were on the independent school district staff prior to the project's inception. Thirteen per cent were working within the education service center region, and three per cent inside the state of Texas, but outside the education service center region. Only one per cent of the project employees were brought to project appointment from outside the state, which means that generally PACE programs were staffed with local or at least regional professionals from a rather small locale.

TABLE XXIV
LOCATION OF PROJECT PROFESSIONALS PRIOR TO PACE APPOINTMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prior Employment Location</th>
<th>Per Cent Response in this Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In school district</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Education Service Center region</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Texas, but outside region</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Texas</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 3: What attributes and/or experiences did the project professional personnel have that enhanced their effectiveness in the work of the project?

In appointing personnel, it appears that the project directors were able to select the top personnel from their
independent school district or immediate area. The attributes and/or characteristics which enhanced the personal contributions of the professionals can be categorized as follows:

1. Change oriented, adaptable, progressive
2. Dedicated to the profession and students
3. Enthusiastic
4. Special training in elementary education, special education, television, or instructional media
5. Fluency in Spanish and English
6. Wide range of educational experience--kindergarten to university

Non-public School Involvement In Project

Question 1: Who were the non-public school personnel and what were their roles in the project's planning, implementation, and day to day operations?

The responses of the project directors to this question indicated that in eight of the eighteen projects, non-public schools were not involved at all. In the planning phase, four projects involved non-public school personnel. At the implementation level, three directors stated that non-public personnel assisted in that process. When it came to the day-to-day operation, the project directors indicated participation in seven of the eighteen projects. At that level, it seemed that the non-public school was treated and
involved equally as well as the home independent school
district and area LEA's.

Question 2: What problems were encountered in planning and
operation of the project with non-public
schools?

With no participation in eight projects, again, the
responses indicated that eight project directors found no
problems in the work with the non-public schools. One project
director stated that the non-public schools sought more and
more of the project services, but were "served as were other
LEA's." Another director pointed out that one non-public
school had planned to participate in the educational television
program, but lacked the funds needed for receivers. It appears
that those working relationships that were established were
beneficial to all parties involved, with no apparent difficulties.

Question 3: If you were doing it again, what would you do to
improve this relationship with the non-public
school?

In retrospect, eight project directors expressed that
they would do nothing different in their relations with the
non-public school. One director stated that he would involve
the non-public school more in all facets of the project, while
another director said he would work for a higher percentage
of participation from the non-public school group. Again,
there are no responses from the eight project directors who
had no non-public school participation, because they expressed no desire for that type involvement.

Project Dissemination

**Question 1:** What were the types and frequencies of the dissemination techniques used with this project?

As shown in Table XXV, the types of dissemination techniques were broad and varied. The percentages of a particular technique being used in the eighteen selected PACE projects indicated heavy usages of inquiry letter—94 per cent, conferences—88 per cent, brochures—83 per cent and speeches—83 per cent. Other techniques utilized above fifty per cent were observations and demonstrations (on-site) with 61 per cent, respectively. Newsletters with a 66 per cent usage, and newspapers with 61 per cent were also dominant dissemination instruments, as was television at 50 per cent. Displays and professional magazine articles, at 39 per cent utilization, were also important tools. It seems that almost every method available to spread information was used in some project, though not with a high frequency among the eighteen projects.

**Question 2:** How did the project visitors learn of the project's existence and program?

The responses to question two were in some ways rather unexpected. As it is shown in Table XXVI, the project directors perceived the main method visitors had used to learn
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Dissemination Techniques</th>
<th>Per Cent of Usage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conferences</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation (on project site)</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inquiry letters</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brochures</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speeches</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixteen millimeter films</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displays</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slides with audio tape</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsletters</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent's bulletin</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrations</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National and State conventions</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional magazine articles</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College classes and organizations</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University department publicity</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video tape</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Service Center mailings</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduled LEA visits</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduled parent nights</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE XXVI

DISSEMINATION PROCEDURES UTILIZED BY PROJECT VISITORS TO LEARN OF PACE PROGRAM EXISTENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dissemination Procedure</th>
<th>Frequencies per Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PACEsetters publication</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference presentations</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word of mouth</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDEA publication</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College and university publicity</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional magazine articles</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television coverage</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper articles</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President's Advisory Council for Title III publication</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsletters</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Research Information Center (ERIC)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEA referrals</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Education Service Center meetings or publications</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brochures</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers moving to other districts</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

of the project was word of mouth, with a frequency of twelve. The second most often mentioned source was professional magazine articles, and the Title III publication "PACEsetters,"
with a frequency of eight. Others, in descending frequency order, were seven Region Education Service Center publications, and conference presentations, five newsletters, and college and university referrals. Next, with a frequency of three, are, television, newspaper, ERIC, and TEA referrals, followed by school counselors, and brochures, with a frequency of two.

**Question 3:** What schools or other institutions have begun similar programs because of this project's concept and stimulus?

The project directors mentioned forty-two LEA's of which they were aware that had utilized their project's concept, in whole or part, in planning and implementing educational programs. The directors mentioned a number of professional and business personnel that had referenced their project activities in constructing buildings, equipment, or instructional media and materials. In the opinion of the project directors, there are undoubtedly a number of additional programs that received their idea from the eighteen PACE programs in this study, but these are very difficult, or impossible, to identify. The project directors felt that their response was at a minimal level.

**Question 4:** What were the geographic areas represented by the project's visitors?
Table XXVII is a summary of the number of visitors to the eighteen PACE programs broken into county, region, state (outside region), out of state, and foreign country categories. Overall, there were 33,430 visitors to the eighteen projects in their three-year period. The project directors indicated that they still have visitors, in spite of the fact that some projects have been closed for about two years. The projects had 12,456 visitors from within the home independent school district's county. It should be noted that one project had no county visitors, while another had the top number of 3,000. From within the region, the projects had 7,734 visitors, with a minimum of none, for two projects, and up to 5,000 for another. In-state visitors (outside region) numbered 6,245. Again, note the wide variance in the number of visitors. The out-of-state visitors numbered 6,885, and that can be attributed to National Conventions held in Texas, as well as the fact that two of the eighteen project areas involved three or four other states. Interestingly, the eighteen projects had 110 visitors from foreign countries. These visitors were predominantly from Mexico, but included persons from Canada, Chile, Argentina, England, Iran, Guatemala, Honduras, and Columbia. It was unexpected to find this subtle form of foreign aid through Title III of ESEA of 1965.
TABLE XXVII

VISITORS TO THE SELECTED PACE PROJECTS
CATEGORIZED BY COUNTY, REGION, STATE,
OUT-OF-STATE, AND FOREIGN COUNTRY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>State (outside region)</th>
<th>Out-of-State</th>
<th>Foreign Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12,456</td>
<td>7,734</td>
<td>6,245</td>
<td>6,885</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total All Categories</td>
<td>33,430</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 5:** If you were doing it again, how would you change your dissemination techniques?

The project directors recommended the following changes in future projects to facilitate the dissemination function:

1. Employ a full time public relations person to generate materials for dissemination, distribute those materials, and to conduct on-site observations.

2. Emphasize dissemination more at state and national level.

3. Develop a professionally formulated brochure for general distribution and inquiry purposes.

4. Produce a fifteen-to-thirty-minute 16mm color film about each project, for general use.

**Project Evaluation**

**Question 1:** What do you consider to have been the strengths of the project?

Table XXVIII reports data concerned with the strengths of the eighteen selected projects. The project directors had strong feelings concerning this area of questioning, and in most instances, were rather emphatic in their responses. The heaviest cluster of strengths was in the category which represented a turn-around of instructional philosophy and methodology throughout the total independent school district. As is shown, there was a frequency of twelve responses in this group. The frequency of responses dropped to five in
TABLE XXVIII

STRENGTHS OF SELECTED PACE PROJECTS
BY CATEGORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories of Strengths</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stimulated, stabilized, and made consistent the independent school district's inservice program</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Created community, parent, and teacher awareness of children's needs</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turned-around the independent school district's instructional plan and concept</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Produced effective instructional guides and materials</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Created a cooperative atmosphere between project area industry, schools, and universities</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Created experimental environment in independent school district</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

three of the categories at the next level. These three categories were (1) project stimulated, stabilized, and made consistent the independent school district inservice program, (2) the project created community, parent, and teacher awareness of student needs, and (3) the project produced effective instructional guides and materials. With a frequency of three, the project directors perceived that the project had created a cooperative environment between schools, colleges,
and universities, and business and industry. This was felt to be of great essence, since there had been a tendency for each group to go its own way in the past. One project director felt that his district's project had created an experimental, change oriented environment in the total school system, which had far reaching effects and implications for educational improvement.

**Question 2:** What do you consider to have been the weaknesses of the project?

At the other end of the project spectrum were the weaknesses of the projects. As shown in Table XXIX, it was felt that the lack of involvement and total commitment, at the district level, was the biggest deterrent, with a frequency of seven. The project personnel appointment and turnover

**TABLE XXIX**

**WEAKNESSES OF SELECTED PACE PROJECTS BY CATEGORY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories of Weakness</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel appointment and turnover</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak evaluation procedures</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production of second quality materials</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor dissemination techniques and plan</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of total involvement and commitment at the independent school district level</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
was the next category of weakness mentioned by project
directors, with a frequency of five. It was expressed
frequently in the interviews that it was a challenge to
secure competent professionals, because of the temporary
nature of the assignment. This was even more difficult in
the employment of technicians for video taping and television
broadcasting. Four directors mentioned weaknesses in the
project evaluation procedures, and two each identified
deficiencies in the project's dissemination techniques, and
the quality of instructional materials the project produced.

**Question 3:** How would you rate your project in the fulfill-
ment of its stated objectives?

The responses to evaluation question three, shown in
Table XXX, show that the project directors felt, overall,
that they had achieved most of the project's objectives.
Twenty-eight per cent felt the objectives were completely
achieved. This feeling came from setting realistic objectives,
and aiming at their fulfillment on a daily basis. The
remaining 72 per cent felt that the project noticeably
achieved its objectives, which they felt to be adequate
progress for the Title III funds that were expended. The
majority of these directors stated that they personally
doubted that any objective is ever completely achieved, so
they chose the second step of the scale. No project director
TABLE XXX
RATING SCALE FOR FULFILLMENT OF PACE PROJECTS' STATED OBJECTIVES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fulfillment Scale</th>
<th>Percentage of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completely achieved</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noticeably achieved</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially achieved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not achieved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

hesitated in choosing the objective achieved level; none chose the partially or not achieved category.

Question 4: What kinds of evaluations were used?

Table XXXI indicates the frequency and types of evaluation methods used in the evaluation of the eighteen PACE programs. It is noted that the procedures vary from the very subjective type, to the use of standardized tests to determine the progress of the participants. The highest frequency of usage was thirteen, in the outside evaluator category, followed by heavy frequencies of eleven, in teacher evaluation, project director evaluation, and the increase of voluntary participation by the professional staff. Nine projects measured student attitudes, and eight projects each used standardized tests and questionnaires, completed by participants, to determine the project's status. Records of
TABLE XXXI

FREQUENCY OF EVALUATION TECHNIQUES UTILIZED
IN THE SELECTED PACE PROJECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Technique</th>
<th>Frequency of Usage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outside evaluator--periodic</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project director--continuing</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher evaluation--reactionaire</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased voluntary staff participation</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student attitudes--interview</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardized tests</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaires--participants</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased use of project materials</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community response--verbal</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student reactions--verbal</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panel of experts</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual evaluation--self</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent conferences</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fewer dropouts</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By project advisory committee</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The use of project materials over a three year period were used in seven projects, and seven projects utilized community response in judging their progress. Student reactions were utilized in six projects, while check lists, completed during
project workshops, and a panel of experts did the evaluation in three of the projects.

**Question 5:** What kinds of evaluative procedures were used?

Table XXXII reflects the categories of procedures used in project evaluation. Thirteen of the projects used third party, outside evaluators, to determine the status of their district's PACE program. Continuing self evaluation procedures utilizing check lists, project material usage records, and participant oriented questionnaires, check lists, and opinionnaires were in eight evaluation schemes. Eight project directors indicated that objective tests, usually standardized, formed the nucleus of their evaluation plan, often in conjunction with an outside evaluator. Four directors revealed

**TABLE XXXII**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Procedure</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Third party evaluation</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing self-evaluation using check lists, circulation records and questionnaires.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective testing evaluation</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No evaluation, except required evaluation by TEA team.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
that their project had no formal evaluation procedure performed, other than the TEA visiting team evaluation, that is required by the state, and a visit by an official from the USOE in two instances. These reviews and visits were very superficial, in the opinion of the project director who made reference to them.

Miscellaneous Questions About the Project

**Question 1:** What effect did the transfer of Title III responsibility from USOE to the TEA have on your project?

The responses to the change of Title III from the USOE in August of 1968, to the TEA, effects are recorded in Table XXXIII. All the responses were of a positive nature, and though the difference felt in two of the projects was great, this was to the benefit of the project. One director said the effect was moderate, while three directors stated the effect was slight. Two-thirds of the project directors,

**TABLE XXXIII**

**EFFECTS SCALE OF TRANSFER OF TITLE III CONTROL FROM USOE TO TEA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect Scale (positive)</th>
<th>Responses per Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Great</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slight</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
twelve to be precise, stated that the change had no effect on their district's project. Several of the directors indicated that communications were improved with the TEA in control, because they found the USOE unresponsive to many inquiries. On the other hand, two project directors stated a preference for federal control, because they "negotiated with the USOE all during the project's life anyway," "found the TEA jealous of the USOE role in State Title III affairs," and "because of the conservative attitude of the TEA, true innovativeness was killed."

**Question 2:** What research studies (evaluative or otherwise) have been conducted concerning this Title III project?

The responses to this question, shown in Table XXXIV, indicate research and analyses conducted in connection with the eighteen select PACE programs. Eleven of the project directors stated that no studies had been conducted concerning their project. They did express the opinion that this was indeed fertile ground for beneficial study. The responses further revealed that ten dissertations had evolved from the projects, and three masters' theses. Eight informative reviews had been published in professional journals about project programs, and at least six term-paper type reports at the university level. One in-depth television documentary had
been produced and broadcast in California about a PACE project reviewed in this study.

TABLE XXXIV
RESEARCH AND ANALYSES CONDUCTED CONCERNING SELECTED PACE PROJECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Research or Analyses</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral dissertations</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters' theses</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional publications</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University term papers</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television documentary</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 3: Would you recommend changes in the following aspects of Title III?

Item 1. The type of project eligible for support
Item 2. The kind of proposal required
Item 3. The criteria for judging proposals
Item 4. The level at which proposals are judged
Item 5. The time period for which proposals are funded
Item 6. The reports required on projects
Item 7. The use that is made of project reports
Item 8. The role of the State Advisory Council
Do you have any specific suggestions that relate to your "yes" answers?

Table XXXV reports data regarding recommended changes in Title III. The questions raised were in a forced-choice
format of responses, either yes, no, or no information. The responses revealed little inclination by the project directors to alter present procedures in Title III in the areas of: type of project eligible for support (item 1), and the criteria for judging proposals (item 3). However, the project directors felt a change should be made in the time period for which proposals are funded (item 5), and in the use that is made of project reports (item 7). It should be noted that the project directors, to a lesser degree, felt that the kind of proposal required (item 2), the level at which proposals are judged (item 4), the reports required on projects (item 6), and the role of the State Advisory Council for Title III (item 8), might be improved with some modification. The responses reflected an unexpected high percentage of project directors who were not familiar with the existence or role of the State Advisory Council for Title III.

Ten directors commented on item 5 and expressed the idea that the project time limit should be a minimum of three years, up to a maximum of five, or perhaps even seven years, when the project evaluation shows adequate performance and progress. Seven directors commented on item 2, stating the opinion that there was much redundancy in the required
TABLE XXXV

RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS CONCERNING SUGGESTED CHANGES IN SPECIFIC AREAS OF TITLE III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Percentage of Yes's</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Percentage of No's</th>
<th>No Information</th>
<th>No Information Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposal, and too much emphasis on verbose, currently popular terms that have no real meaning in the judging of what proposals deserve funding. The comment was also made that most of the LEA proposals, the TEA, and the USOE, had all given mere lip service to the evaluation and dissemination phases of project activities. Seven comments were recorded concerning item seven, about the use of project reports, stating that in reality, they were used very little, and were
a form of "busy work"; but, nonetheless, they contained some needed information that would be of great value, if disseminated at the state and national levels. One project director summed it up rather candidly when he said, "limit the amount of information required, and use fully the data submitted."

**Question 4:** Do you have any additional comments that you feel are pertinent concerning Title III, PACE projects that have not been mentioned in the interview?

This open-ended question was of a broad nature and intended to elicit any ideas the project director might have about Title III, PACE programs that were not drawn out in the prescribed interview. Some of the responses refer to areas covered earlier in the interview, but will be categorized and delineated here. Nine of the project directors stressed the great impact the project had exerted on their independent school district, its community, and surrounding LEA's and colleges. Three others suggested that regular meetings be held, for all educators to attend, at the state and national levels, where PACE programs are on display and discussed, to widen the diffusion of successful innovations. One project director stated that their PACE program had opened the district's doors to state and national recognition. One director suggested placement of fiscal control with another
public entity, outside the project district, so that the conservative elements, within his independent school district, could not stifle the program's innovativeness. Several directors felt that the 20 per cent variance limit in a budget expenditure account should be raised, or eliminated, because it constrained the project's flexibility and ability to adapt in an innovative fashion. Another director commented that, "Title III risk funds are a boom to education, but Regional Education Service Centers have absorbed so many of the dollars that it has all but eliminated PACE programs." Finally, one director related that Title III is "a great program, because it gave our economically poor district a chance to experiment, that would have never been otherwise. It increased the morale and pride in our school district substantially, at both the student and teacher level."
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purposes of this study have been to report the past and residual effects of eighteen selected, three-year ESEA Title III PACE projects in Texas, to formulate generalizations about these Projects to Advance Creativity in Education, and to make recommendations for improvement of Texas education through the future use of these Title III funds.

This study included a review of literature relating to federal aid to education, but gave specific attention to the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Title III of ESEA was given special attention, and its progression through congress was delineated. In addition to this, the study was discussed with Title III staff members of the Texas Education Agency, and the TEA Title III records, relating to the eighteen selected projects, were resourced for supplementary and background data.

The personal interview technique was utilized to secure data on the operation of the Title III programs in the eighteen selected Texas school districts. The interview guide
was validated by a panel of five experts recommended by the Deputy Commissioner of Education at the TEA. The project schools were chosen because they composed all PACE programs in Texas that were in operation for the maximum of three years that Title III allows, and were planned and operated throughout the project's existence by an independent school district. All of the eighteen project directors of the selected projects were interviewed. The data presented in the study represents their combined perceptions concerning the past and residual status of the three-year PACE programs. It was assumed that these educators would respond honestly to the questions raised in the interview. The project schools' average daily attendance varied from 212 students to a high of 208,800, and these independent school districts are widely distributed throughout the state.

To carry out the purposes of this study, the interview questions were placed into eight categories. These categories were: project planning, project activities, project finance, project personnel, non-public school involvement, project dissemination, project evaluation, and miscellaneous questions. The findings have been recorded in Chapter IV, and a synopsis of those findings is written here.
Project Planning

In 85 per cent of the school districts, the idea for the project came from a top administrator, or from a consultant outside the district. The actual planning of the projects was, again, done mainly by administrators and outside consultants, with some teacher involvement. The involvement of community institutions was moderate to minimal, and at a superficial level, in many instances. The project directors felt that more time should be devoted to the planning phase, with the real involvement of school personnel, parents, the overall community, and area school personnel. This, in their opinion, would materially strengthen the projects.

Project Activities

A majority of the project directors expressed strong convictions about the effects the project activities had exerted on the district, and in some instances, the entire project area. The gains were seen in the improvement of in-service programs, the types and usage of instructional media, and abrupt changes in the school district's instructional philosophy. Too, the projects stimulated cooperation among schools, industry, community agencies, and colleges. Additional unexpected gains were noted where the project concept had become the heart of the instructional program and was overflowing into all facets
of the school program, plus, the interest that the project created at the parent and community level. It was revealed in the data that personnel problems were the factors most impeding the projects, followed by communications with the professional staff. In spite of these problems, the projects' activities were absorbed into the school districts' programs at a very desirable level, and a substantial number of instructional materials and in-service tools were created. Visitors to the project site were considered an integral and necessary part of the program. If doing it again, the directors indicated, they would place more emphasis on quality, and not just quantity of services, and increase the involvement of, and information to, the professional personnel served.

Project Finance

The project directors were of the opinion that the Title III funds received were adequate. The funding of the project activities since federal aid has ceased, was mainly from local funds, but state and other federal funds were also being used. The percentages of funds for personnel training, dissemination, evaluation, and outside consultants, identified wide variances among the projects' priorities in these categories. It appears that the 27 per cent of the total funds expended in these four categories might be rather
minimal, since these are most important factors in a PACE project's effectiveness. In retrospect, the directors recommended built-in fund increases to offset personnel turnover, salary increases, and overall dollar loss to inflation, along with the coordination of Title III funds' usage with other federal programs in a project area.

Project Personnel

The eighteen selected PACE projects employed 574 persons during their three operational years. Eighty-three per cent of the professional personnel came from within the project school districts, and 96 per cent from within the education service center regions. This seemed to have no noticeable effect on the projects, but project directors did mention personnel problems as one of the main difficulties they encountered. The personnel employed were chosen mainly because of their enthusiasm, progressive attitude, adaptability and special attributes that complemented the needs in a particular project.

Non-public School Involvement

In the planning and implementation phases of PACE projects, the non-public school involvement was either non-existent or minimal. At the day-to-day operational level,
the involvement was somewhat improved, with non-public school pupils and teachers participating on an equal basis. No project director mentioned any problem in the work with the non-public schools. It was pointed out that they would work for a greater degree of participation in this area, if they were to do it again. The level of non-public school involvement was rather low, and even ignored in eight of the projects. This is contrary to the regulations and overall concept of Title III.

Project Dissemination

In this category, letters, conferences, brochures, and speeches were the most often used technique. Observations and on-site demonstrations were also heavily utilized. In spite of these usages, the project directors stated that most visitors had been informed about the project through: word of mouth, professional magazine articles, and the Title III publication "PACEsetters." Because of these dissemination activities, the directors could identify forty-two programs that were using at least a portion of their district's PACE project concept. The number of visitors to the projects numbered 33,430, with 6,885 of these coming from outside the state, and 110 visitors from foreign countries. For future projects, the project directors recommended employment of a
full time public relations person to plan and conduct dissemination activities. They felt the production of a 16mm film about each project, and extensive dissemination at the state and national level, would also prove effective.

**Project Evaluation**

The most mentioned strength was in the complete turn-around of instructional philosophy and methodology in an entire school district. Other strengths were in the improvement of in-service programs, increased awareness of student needs, and the instructional materials the project produced. When weaknesses were mentioned, the problem of personnel appointment and turnover, the lack of total commitment and involvement at the school district level, and weak evaluation procedures were most dominant. All project directors expressed the opinion that their district's project had either noticeably, or completely, achieved its objectives. Thirteen of the projects had third party evaluation, often in conjunction with standardized tests. With few exceptions, projects made use of self-evaluative instruments completed by the participants, as well as records of project material usage in their evaluative procedures. Overall, the evaluations of the eighteen projects were somewhat irregular and of a subjective nature, but some outside expertise was skillfully utilized.
Miscellaneous Questions About the Projects

In questioning concerning the transfer of Title III responsibility from the United States Office of Education to the Texas Education Agency, a majority of the directors indicated no effect, but some did prefer the TEA, and others, USOE control.

A question concerning research studies about the selected PACE programs revealed that thirteen graduate theses and fourteen publications or term papers had been written. One television documentary had also been produced.

When questioned about changes they would recommend in the Title III program, the directors felt changes were needed in the use that is made of project reports, and in the time period for which projects are funded. In their opinion, the reports should be disseminated at state and national levels, and the funding time maximum raised to at least five, and perhaps seven years, if appropriate evaluation indicates progress. The non-familiarity of the project directors with the role of the State Advisory Council for Title III was very high. The directors stated that they felt that most PACE projects, the TEA, and USOE had given only lip service to true evaluation and dissemination procedures.
In response to an open-ended question that requested any additional comments about Title III, nine of the project directors again emphasized the impact felt in the school, the community, and project area, because of the project. Others commented that open meetings for all educators to attend, should be held to display and discuss PACE projects at the state and national levels. Another suggested placement of fiscal control with another public entity, so that the conservative elements within a school district could not stifle the program's innovativeness. The comment was made that PACE programs have been "killed" because the Title III funds are now going to education service centers. On the positive side, a director stated that his district's project had been a great chance for experimentation never realized before, because of the district's poverty. He felt that this opportunity had created much pride in the school, at both the student and teacher level.

Conclusions

Within the limitations and scope of this study, and by the synthesizing of the preceding data, the following generalizations about the selected PACE programs are implied
1. Federal funds that represent general aid to education are effective in stimulating educational innovation and exemplary programs in Texas.

2. Adequate opportunity has not been given to professional personnel below the central administrative level to conceive or assist in the planning of a PACE program.

3. There was very minimal parent, community, business, industrial, and project area LEA involvement in the planning of the PACE programs.

4. Title III funds and the subsequent activities have demonstrated their power as a district wide change agent.

5. Title III projects can create a cooperative environment in a community and/or project area that has far reaching educational dimensions.

6. There were many unanticipated benefits generated outside the projects stated objectives, such as university preservice training.

7. The projects' concept was viewed first-hand by thousands of visitors.

8. Independent school districts have demonstrated that innovative ideas will be integrated into their program with local funding if they prove worthwhile.

9. The personnel employed by PACE projects came from small geographic areas, which could be limiting to the programs' innovative perspective.
10. Non-public school involvement was minimized, ignored, or circumvented in many Texas PACE projects.

11. In Texas, where working relationships existed, or were created, public schools and non-public schools worked together extremely well.

12. There were sharp variances in the amounts and quality of project dissemination activities in the Texas projects.

13. In most Texas projects, the evaluative plan was vague, general, and not process-product or objectively oriented.

14. Some project directors had little grasp of the overall Title III concept at the state and national level, in spite of the three year involvement with the program.

15. Problems with the appointment and turnover of personnel were major impediments to all phases of the PACE program.

16. A majority of the project directors, of the selected Texas projects, felt that the maximum funding period should be five years, if appropriate evaluation shows progress.

17. In Texas, there have been no questions concerning the separation of church and state in the use of Title III funds.
18. PACE projects have demonstrated their ability to stimulate change in a large geographic area with proper dissemination activity.

19. The selected Texas PACE projects have stimulated in-depth graduate research about their concept and activities.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are based upon the findings and conclusions of this study

1. PACE regulations and guidelines should specify certain percentage levels for expenditures in the critical areas of personnel training, dissemination, evaluation, and utilization of outside district expertise.

2. With evidence of adequate project performance, budgets should have automatic fund increases to accommodate normal salary increases, and to offset normal inflation, without loss of services.

3. Procedures should be outlined to facilitate the coordinated use of the various ESEA and other federal funds.

4. The TEA, the USOE, and/or the Education Service Centers should employ persons with expertise in planning, dissemination, and evaluation, to assist LEA's in the writing of Title III innovative proposals.
5. All projects funded for 100,000 dollars or more annually, should be required to appoint a full-time project director with full-time administrative duties.

6. All projects should be required to appoint, for at least one-half time, a person to plan, and conduct, effective dissemination of the project's concept and activities.

7. Project proposals should delineate specifically the involvement of non-public school pupils and professional staff members, with this involvement required for initial approval or a continuation grant.

8. There should be efforts exerted to enlarge the geographic area of recruitment for project personnel.

9. Third party evaluations should be mandatory, with the team of evaluators selected by the TEA, and/or USOE, from a national roster of experts.

10. Title III, PACE seminars that stress the change process and overall concept of Title III, should be conducted at state and regional levels for prospective grantees.

11. There should be evidence that high quality, qualified personnel are available for project appointment, prior to project approval.

12. Where appropriate needs have been identified for a PACE program, a three-to-six-month planning grant should be required and funded.
13. Evaluation models that exemplify the mood of innovativeness and creativity, within a process-product framework, should be constructed.
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LOCATION OF SELECTED TITLE III PROJECTS AND DISTRICT'S ADA

1. Houston 208,800
2. Dallas 144,805
3. El Paso 56,401
4. El Paso 56,401
5. Corpus Christi 42,032
6. Spring Branch** 34,074
7. Lubbock 31,323
8. Northeast * 25,587
9. Edgewood * 20,378
10. Abilene 17,970
11. San Angelo 13,602
12. South Park 11,920
13. Cypress-Fairbanks 5,597
14. Greenville 5,231
15. Del Valle 2,772
16. Lampasas 1,589
17. Austin State 1,179
18. Trinidad 212

* In San Antonio
** In Houston
APPENDIX B
PACE STATISTICAL DATA-TEA

Section A:

3. Major Description of Project: Innovative adaptive Exemplary

4. Types of activity: A B C D E F

5. Title:

6. Purpose and Major Emphasis Number:

17a. A. Total counties served
    B. Total number LEAs served
    C. Total estimated population in geographic area served

18. Latest average per pupil ADA expenditure of LEAs served

Section B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funds requested</th>
<th>Funds allocated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Initial application</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st continuation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd continuation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Title III funds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Persons served</th>
<th>Totals</th>
<th>Staff members in project in-service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enrolled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Total participants by race</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROJECT OBJECTIVES (by year):
I. PROJECT PLANNING

1. Who initiated the idea and/or proposal for you school district's project?

   school board___
   principal ___
   teachers ___
   superintendent ___
   central administration
   consultant (outside district)___
   counselor ___
   other: ________________________

2. What persons composed the planning team for the project?

   lay persons ___
   students ___
   parents ___
   teachers ___
   school board members ___
   superintendent ___
   principals ___
   central administrators ___
   other: ________________________

3. What relationships were utilized or established with other community organizations or institutions due to the planning and implementation of this project?

   business___
   chamber of commerce___
   city___
   county___
   groups of business people___
   civic groups___
   churches___
   private or parochial schools___
   other: ________________________

4. What, in retrospect, would you do differently should you plan another Title III project?
II. PROJECT ACTIVITIES

1. What quantitative changes in your school resulted from the Title III project?

2. What qualitative changes are in evidence in your school program because of the Title III project?

3. How receptive was the total school district staff to the project's existence and its contribution to the district's overall program? What caused this attitude?

4. What was accomplished by the project outside of its stated objectives that was important?

5. What factors were most dominate in impeding or at least complicating the successful operation of the project?

6. What project activities have been integrated into your school district program because of the project's influence?
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7. What significant instructional materials have been produced by this project?

8. What effects did the disruption and exposure to visitors have on the project's program?

9. What, in retrospect, would you do differently in structuring project activities of another Title III project?

III. PROJECT FINANCE

1. How adequate were the allocated Title III funds for accomplishing the project's objectives?

  Excellent
  Good
  Fair
  Poor
  Inadequate
  Don't know
  Other:

2. If the project's activities are continuing since Federal support has ceased, what is the source of funds?

  Local district funds
  Fees from students
  Business and Industry
  State Funds
  Foundations
  A new Federal grant
  Other:

3. What percentage of the total three year funds were spent for:

   (1) personnel training
   (2) dissemination
   (3) evaluation
   (4) operation overhead
4. What, in retrospect, would you do differently should you finance another Title III project?

IV. PROJECT PERSONNEL

1. Where were the project personnel employed prior to their project appointment? (record the number in each category)

   In district
   Within region
   In state-outside region
   Out of state
   Other:

2. By the year, how many professional persons were employed by the project?

   1966
   1967
   1968
   1969
   1970

V. NON-PUBLIC SCHOOL INVOLVEMENT IN PROJECT

1. What was the involvement of non-public schools in the project's:

   (a) Planning

   (b) Implementation

   (c) Day to day operation

2. What problems have been encountered in the planning and operation of the project with non-public schools?
VI. PROJECT DISSEMINATION

1. What were the types and frequencies of the dissemination techniques used with this project?

- letters
- brochures
- newsletters
- newspapers
- radio
- television
- verbal presentations
- 16 mm films
- displays
- none
- OTHER:

2. How did project visitors learn of the project's existence and program?

3. How many schools or other institutions have begun similar programs because of this project's concept and stimulus?

4. What were the geographic areas represented by the project's visitors?

- county
- region
- state
- out of state (specify)
- other:

5. If you were doing it again, how would you change your dissemination techniques?
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VII. PROJECT EVALUATION

1. What do you consider to have been the strengths of the project?

2. What do you consider to have been the weaknesses of the project?

3. How would you rate your project in the fulfillment of its state objectives?

   partially achieved
   noticeably achieved
   completely achieved
   not achieved
   other: ____________________

4. What kinds of evaluations were used?

5. What were the evaluation procedures and details?
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VIII. MISCELLANEOUS QUESTIONS ABOUT THE PROJECT

1. What effect did the transfer of Title III responsibility from the United States Office of Education to the Texas Education Agency have on your project?

   great_______  Comment:
   moderate______
   slight_______
   none__________

2. What research studies have been conducted about this Title III project?

3. Would you recommend changes in the following aspects of Title III?

   The type of project eligible for support
   The kind of proposal required
   The criteria for judging proposals
   The level at which proposals are judged
   The time period for which proposals are funded
   The reports required on projects
   The use that is made of project reports

   YES  NO

   [Space for responses]

   Do you have specific suggestions that relate to your "yes" answers above?

4. Please make any additional comment you feel is pertinent that has not been addressed in the above questions!
Mr. Crandall J. Young
Education Service Center,
Region X
P. O. Box 1300
Richardson, Texas 75080

Dear Crandall:

I would recommend the following list of persons as experts in the area of Title III from which you might select a list that would be competent to validate information on Title III projects.

Dr. Jimmy Williamson, Region XI
Carlton Moffat, Dallas ISD
Marvin Kirkman, Independent Consultant
Dr. Easton Wall, Region XVI
Barry Thompson, Waco ISD
Jack Elrod, Texas Education Agency
Dr. Dan Long, North East ISD
Dr. Bill Reeves, Pan American University
Dr. John Dameron, Region XVIII
Dr. Charles Benson, Region XIX
Dr. Clyde Greer, Eanes ISD
Rogers L. Barton, Dallas ISD

If I can provide you with additional information, please make the request.

Very truly yours,

M. L. Brockett
Deputy Commissioner
of Education
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FIVE MEMBER PANEL OF EXPERTS FOR THE INTERVIEW GUIDE

Rogers Barton
Associate Superintendent
Dallas Independent School District
Dallas, Texas

Marvin Kirkman
Independent Consultant
1204 Edgefield Drive
Plano, Texas

Barry Thompson
Assistant Superintendent
Waco Public Schools
Waco, Texas

Dr. Easton Wall
Associate Director
Region 16, Education Service Center
Amarillo, Texas

Dr. Jimmy Williamson
Assistant Director
Region 11, Education Service Center
Ft. Worth, Texas
Thank you for agreeing to assist in establishing the validity and clarity of an interview guide to be used as a part of my doctoral dissertation at North Texas State University. The dissertation is being done under the direction of Dr. E. Vaughn Huffstutler, Division of Educational Leadership.

The study concerns selected ESEA Title III, PACE projects that have been under the control of an independent school district since their conception and completion, for a period of three years. Through these interviews, some of the effects of these projects on educational processes in Texas will be derived. The interview will be conducted with the project director or superintendent in the city where the project is located.

Enclosed is a copy of all questions that have been included on the tentative interview guide. The directions are included with the instrument. Your assistance is sincerely appreciated and will add greatly to the validity of the study.

Please return the instrument to me in the enclosed, stamped self-addressed envelope. Thank you very much.

Sincerely yours,

Crandall J. Young

CJY: jo
Enclosures
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VALIDATING INSTRUMENT FOR TITLE III, ESEA, PACE INTERVIEW GUIDE

Instructions:

A. Please check yes in the space provided if, in your judgement, the question is appropriate, applicable and pertinent in studying a PACE project. If in your judgement, the question is not pertinent, check no in the space provided and comment.

B. Please check clear in the space provided if, in your judgement, the question is clearly stated. Please check not clear if you have difficulty understanding the question and suggest changes under comment.

C. At the end of each category, space has been provided for you to add other questions that you think are pertinent that should be added to that category. If additional space is needed you may use the back of the sheet.

I. PROJECT PLANNING

1. Who initiated the idea and/or proposal for your school district's project?
   Yes  No  Comment:

   Clear  Not clear  Comment:

2. What persons composed the planning team for the project?
   Yes  No  Comment:

   Clear  Not clear  Comment:

3. What relationships were utilized or established with other community organizations or institutions due to the planning and implementation of this project?
   Yes  No  Comment:

   Clear  Not clear  Comment:
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4. What in retrospect, would you do differently should you plan another Title III project?
   Yes  No  Comment:
   ☐  ☐
   Clear  Not clear  Comment:
   ☐  ☐

Additional questions which you feel should be included in this category:

II. PROJECT ACTIVITIES

1. What quantitative changes in your school district resulted from the Title III project?
   Yes  No  Comment:
   ☐  ☐
   Clear  Not clear  Comment:
   ☐  ☐

2. What qualitative changes are in evidence in your school program because of the Title III project?
   Yes  No  Comment:
   ☐  ☐
   Clear  Not clear  Comment:
   ☐  ☐

3. How receptive was the total school district staff to the project's existence and its contribution to the district's overall program? What caused this attitude?
   Yes  No  Comment:
   ☐  ☐
   Clear  Not clear  Comment:
4. What was accomplished outside of the project's objectives that was important?
   Yes  No  Comment:
   Clear  Not clear  Comment:

5. What factors were dominate in impeding or at least complicating the successful operation of the project?
   Yes  No  Comment:
   Clear  Not clear  Comment:

6. What project activities have been integrated into your school district's program because of the project's influence?
   Yes  No  Comment:
   Clear  Not clear  Comment:

7. What significant instructional materials have been produced by this project?
   Yes  No  Comment:
   Clear  Not clear  Comment:

8. What affect did the interruption and exposure to visitors have on the project's program?
   Yes  No  Comment:
   Clear  Not clear  Comment:

9. What in retrospect, would you do differently in structuring project activities of another Title III project?
   Yes  No  Comment:
   Clear  Not clear  Comment:
III. PROJECT FINANCE

1. How adequate were the allocated Title III funds for accomplishing the project's objectives?
   - Yes  No  Comment:
     - Clear  Not clear  Comment:

2. If the project activities are continuing since Federal support has ceased, what is the source of the funds?
   - Yes  No  Comment:
     - Clear  Not clear  Comment:

3. What were the approximate percentages of the total three year funds that were spent for; personnel training, dissemination, evaluation, operation overhead and other?
   - Yes  No  Comment:
     - Clear  Not clear  Comment:

4. What is retrospect, would you do differently should you finance another Title III project?
   - Yes  No  Comment:
     - Clear  Not clear  Comment:

Additional questions which you feel should be included in this category:
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IV. PROJECT PERSONNEL
1. By the year, how many professional persons were employed by the project?
   Yes No Comment:
   [/] [/] [/]

2. Where were the project personnel employed prior to their project appointment?
   (In district, within region, in state but outside region, out of state, other)
   Yes No Comment:
   [/] [/] [/]

   Clear Not Clear Comment:
   [/] [/] [/] [/] /

3. What attributes and/or experiences did the project personnel have that enhanced their effectiveness in the work of the project?
   Yes No Comment:
   [/] [/] [/] [/] [/] [/] [/] [/]

   Clear Not clear Comment:
   [/] [/] [/] [/] [/]

   Additional questions which you feel should be included in this category:

V. NON-PUBLIC SCHOOL INVOLVEMENT IN PROJECT
1. What was the involvement of non-public schools in the project's planning, implementation and day-to-day operation?
   Yes No Comment:
   [/] [/] [/] [/] [/] [/]

   Clear Not clear Comment:
   [/] [/] [/] [/] [/] [/] [/] [/] [/] [/] [/] [/]

2. What problems have been encountered in the planning and operation of the project with non-public schools?
   Yes No Comment:
   [/] [/] [/] [/] [/]

   Clear Not clear Comment:
   [/] [/] [/] [/] [/] [/]
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VI. PROJECT DISSEMINATION

1. What were the types and frequencies of the dissemination techniques used with this project?
   Yes  No  Comment:
   Clear  Not clear  Comment:

2. How did project visitors learn of the project's existence?
   Yes  No  Comment:
   Clear  Not clear  Comment:

3. How many schools or other institutions have begun similar programs because of this project's concept and stimulus?
   Yes  No  Comment:
   Clear  Not clear  Comment:

4. What were the geographic areas represented by the project's visitors?
   Yes  No  Comment:
   Clear  Not clear  Comment:

5. If you were doing it again, how would you change your dissemination techniques?
   Yes  No  Comment:
   Clear  Not clear  Comment:

Additional questions which you feel should be included in this category:
VII. PROJECT EVALUATION

1. What were the project's objectives?
   Yes  No  Comment:
   Clear  Not clear  Comment:

2. What do you consider to have been the strengths and weaknesses of the project?
   Yes  No  Comment:
   Clear  Not clear  Comment:

3. How would you rate your project in its fulfillment of the stated objectives?
   Yes  No  Comment:
   Clear  Not clear  Comment:

4. What kinds of evaluative instruments and procedures were used?
   Yes  No  Comment:
   Clear  Not clear  Comment:

Additional questions which you feel should be included in this category:
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VIII. MISCELLANEOUS QUESTIONS ABOUT THE PROJECT

1. What affect did the transfer of Title III responsibility from the United States Office of Education to the Texas Education Agency have on your project?
   Yes  No  Comment:
   (/)  (/)
   Clear  Not clear  Comment:
   (/)  (/)

2. Have any research studies been conducted about this Title III project?
   Yes  No  Comment:
   (/)  (/)
   Clear  Not clear  Comment:
   (/)  (/)

3. Would you recommend changes in the following aspect of Title III?
   YES  NO
   The type of project eligible for support
   The kind of proposal required
   The criteria for judging proposals
   The level at which proposals are judged
   The time period for which proposals are funded
   The reports required on projects
   The use that is made of project reports

   Do you have suggestions that relate to your "yes" answers above?
   Yes  No  Comment:
   (/)  (/)
   Clear  Not clear  Comment:
   (/)  (/)

Additional questions which you feel should be included in this category:
I. PROJECT PLANNING:

1. Who initiated the idea and/or proposal for your school district's project?

   school board
   principal(s)
   teachers
   supt.
   central administration
   consultant outside district
   counselors
   others:

2. What persons composed the planning team for the project?

   lay persons
   students
   parents
   teachers
   school board members
   supt.
   principals
   central administrators
   TEA personnel
   college & Univ. personnel
   cultural organ. personnel
   state agencies personnel
   federal personnel
   community agencies personnel
   other:

3. What relationships were utilized or established with other community organizations or institutions due to the planning and implementation of this project?

   business
   chamber of commerce
   city
   county
   groups of business people
   civic groups
   churches
   private or parochial schools
   other:

4. What in retrospect, would you do differently should you plan another Title III project?
II. PROJECT ACTIVITIES:

1. What quantitative changes in your school resulted from the Title III project?

2. What qualitative changes are in evidence in your school program because of the Title III project?

3. How receptive were: (1) principals, (2) supervisors, (3) teachers, to the project's existence and its contributions to the district's overall program?

   Scale: Poorly
   Moderately
   Highly

   What caused this attitude in your opinion?

4. What was accomplished by the project outside of its stated objectives that was important?

5. What factors were most dominate in impeding or at least complicating the successful operation of the project?

   Personnel
   Equipment and Materials
   Communications
   Facilities
   Budget
   Acceptance and Cooperation
   Redtape and paperwork
   Selling and explaining Title III
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6. What project activities have been integrated into your school district program because of the project's influence?

7. What important instructional materials have been produced by this project?

8. What affect did the interruption by and exposure to visitors, have on the project's program?

   great________
   moderate_____
   slight_______
   none________

   Comment: ________________________________

9. What in retrospect, would you do differently in structuring project activities?

III. PROJECT FINANCE:

1. How adequate were the allocated Title III funds for accomplishing the project's objectives?

   Excellent____
   Good_____  
   Fair_____  
   Poor______
   Inadequate____
   Don't know____
   other:___________________________________

2. If the project's activities are continuing since Federal support has ceased, what is the source of the funds?

   Local funds_____
   Fees from students_____ 
   Business and industry_____
   State funds_____
   Foundation funds(Ford, etc.)_____
   A new Federal grant_____
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3. What percentage, approximately, of the total three year funds were spent for:

1) personnel training
2) dissemination
3) evaluation
4) outside consultants
5) other:

4. What in retrospect, would you do differently should you seek funding of another Title III project?

IV. PROJECT PERSONNEL:

1. By the year, how many professional persons and non-professional persons were employed by the project?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Prof.</th>
<th>Non-Prof.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Where were the project personnel employed prior to their project appointment? (numbers in each category)

In district________
Within region________
In state, outside region________
Out of state________
Other:________

3. What attributes and/or experiences did the project personnel have that enhanced their effectiveness in the work of the project? (professionals)

V. NON-PUBLIC SCHOOL INVOLVEMENT IN PROJECT:

1. Who were the non-public school personnel and what were their roles in the project?

1) Planning-

2) Implementation-
2. What problems were encountered in planning and operation of the project with non-public schools?

3. If you were doing it again, what would you do to improve this relationship with the non-public school?

VI. PROJECT DISSEMINATION:

1. What were the types and frequencies of the dissemination techniques used with this project?

conferences
observation
demonstrations
letters
brochures
Newsletters
radio


2. How did the project visitors learn of the project's existence and program?

3. What schools or other institutions have begun similar programs because of this project's concept and stimulus?

4. What were the geographic areas represented by the project's visitors? (numbers)

county
region
state
out of state (list)
other:
5. If you were doing it again, how would you change your dissemination techniques?

VII. PROJECT EVALUATION:

1. What do you consider to have been the strengths of the project?

2. What do you consider to have been the weaknesses of the project?

3. How would you rate your project in the fulfillment of its stated objectives?

   - completely achieved
   - noticeably achieved
   - partially achieved
   - not achieved
   - other: ________________________________

Comment: ________________________________

4. What kinds of evaluations were used?

   - standardized tests
   - teacher evaluation
   - outside special evaluators
   - conferences, interviews, questionnaires
   - directors evaluation
   - subjective tests
   - increasing achievement (basic skills)
   - student reaction
   - parent attitude and community response
   - other: ________________________________

Comment: ________________________________

   - increase, voluntary participation by consultants
   - annual and other reports
   - No. using library or other materials
   - State depts. of education
   - student attitudes
   - attendance, increase
   - check lists, inventory, surveys
   - fewer dropouts
   - computer data
   - by movies and taped records
5. What kinds of evaluative procedures were used?

VIII. MISCELLANEOUS QUESTIONS ABOUT THE PROJECT:

1. What affect did the transfer of Title III responsibility from the USOE to the TEA have on your project?

   great____   Comment:
   moderate____
   slight____
   none____

2. What research studies (evaluative or otherwise) have been conducted concerning this Title III project?

3. Would you recommend changes in the following aspects of Title III?

   The type of project eligible for support  yes  no
   The kind of proposal required
   The criteria for judging proposals
   The level at which proposals are judged
   The time period for which proposals are funded
   The reports required on projects
   The use that is made of project reports
   The role of the State Advisory Council

   Do you have any specific suggestions that relate to your "yes" answers, above?

4. Do you have any additional comments that you feel are pertinent concerning Title III, PACE projects that have not been mentioned in the interview?
Your help is requested in a study of selected Title III, Elementary Secondary Education Act, Projects Advance Creativity in Education projects in Texas.

Your school's PACE project is one of eighteen in the state that has been under Independent School District control from conception until completion, for the maximum of three years allowed. This study is being conducted as a part of a doctoral dissertation under the direction of Dr. E. Vaughn Huffstutler, Division of Educational Leadership, North Texas State University.

To obtain the needed data, each of the eighteen selected PACE projects directors or superintendent (if there was no project director) will be interviewed at a time that is scheduled at their convenience. Questions will be asked concerning the director's perceptions about the project's, planning, activities, finance, personnel, non-public school involvement, dissemination and evaluation. Certain quantitative data will be derived from the Texas Education Agency project records. If it is permissible for this interview to be conducted, please return the enclosed card to me, indicating the person I should contact to arrange the interview. The immediate return of the card will enable the interview to be completed before the close of this school year, and will be greatly appreciated.

The interview will take about an hour and will require no reference to school records. The project director's interview responses will not be identified, but his input will be an important contribution to this study because of the limited number of projects being studied. Thank you very much for your time and cooperation.

Sincerely,

Crandall J. Young
October 22, 1970

Dr. Jim Clark
Texas Education Agency
Title III, ESEA
Austin, Texas 78711

Dear Dr. Clark:

This is to request permission to attain access to the Texas Education Agency's official files that concern all TITLE III projects in the state. This information, if permission is granted, will be utilized in a proposed dissertation at North Texas State University about ESEA TITLE III effects on Texas education.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely yours,

Crandall J. Young

Crandall J. Young
November 6, 1970

Mr. Crandall J. Young  
Manager, Interface  
Region X Education Service Center  
P. O. Box 1300  
Richardson, Texas  75080

Dear Mr. Young:

We will be very happy to review our records pertaining to Title III Projects in Texas and will look forward to hearing from you on the date of your proposed visit.

Good luck on your dissertation.

Sincerely,  

James V. Clark, Director  
Title III, ESEA
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