An examination of the degree to which ES sponsored activities continued in the 10 rural school districts is particularly salient to this study of organizational change because of the explicit premises of the ES program. The 10 districts were to use ES funds to plan and implement comprehensive changes which would be "continuable" once the special funding ended. Thus, as described in Chapter 4, ES funds were considered to be a temporary "bubble in the budget"—special funding for a massive influx of resources to achieve the objective of comprehensive change.

This expectation presupposed that ES monies would serve as a "catalyst" for change; that they would be used to facilitate change rather than to sustain programs. Some changes might cost nothing at all to maintain, such as a reorganized schedule or a community advisory committee; it was expected (or hoped) that other, more costly changes would become so important to the districts that they would find local funding for them.

The ES/Washington planners did not intend to force the expansion of local school-district budgets at the end of ES funding to accommodate expensive alterations. Instead, at that time, each district was expected to be doing markedly different educational things, but at either the same per-pupil costs as before its ES project, or at an increased level which could be borne by the school district itself.

However, a recent study by Berman and McLaughlin (1977) casts considerable doubt on the assumption that schools will usually be able
to continue programs that were implemented with externally provided "seed money." Their investigation of federally funded Title IV programs for educational innovation revealed that the implementation and support strategies used by many districts in launching innovative programs reduced the likelihood that such innovations could be continued unless alternative, *external* support funds could be found; thus, even successful implementation does not ensure later institutionalization.

**OUR APPROACH TO INVESTIGATING CONTINUATION**

Despite the fact that implementation occurred primarily at the school level, our investigation treated continuation as a district-level phenomenon, since ES was designed as a district-level program. Without exception, the early documents prepared by ES/Washington planners referred to changing "education" in all facets for all students in all grades, and conspicuously did not refer to change in individual "schools." Although schools became the unit of implementation, they were not conceived of by the ES program planners as the unit of change. Furthermore, as discussed in Chapter 4, planning of the projects and the negotiation process between the federal agency and the local school districts were at the district level, as was the responsibility for building into the projects a plan for continuation. Finally, if continuation were to be district wide, one can presume the necessity for continued administrative support at the district level, for the decision to be made and enforced at the district level, and, if necessary, for provisions to be made for funding allocation—also a district-level decision.

We also paid attention, however, to continuation of change within specific schools. A decision to continue, especially when made at a centralized administrative level, does not necessarily guarantee that the decision will be carried out at other levels in the system, such as in all schools or relevant classrooms—particularly in such loosely linked systems as schools. However, continuation occurring at anything but the district level would constitute only "pockets of continuation" and would not fulfill the ES program's objectives. Only if continuation were visible district wide would the districts be achieving the explicit objectives of the ES program.