The four 1967 institutes were coordinated through a consortium approach wherein the Center for Vocational and Technical Education, the Ohio State University served as the coordinating agency for designing the program, preparing staff, evaluating the program, writing the final report, disseminating information, and following up participants. The General Leadership Development Institutes held at Mississippi State University and Utah State University were designed to meet the needs of technical education personnel in relatively new positions. The State Staff Development Institutes held at the University of California at Los Angeles and The University of Connecticut were designed specifically to help experienced technical education personnel to better understand and fulfill their state leadership roles. Instructional materials for the institutes included the original Compilation of Technical Education Materials (VT 002 936) and the supplements (VT 002 930, VT 002 928) prepared for the 1966 institutes, and additional commissioned papers and materials. Recommendations indicate that the institutes planned and conducted on the consortium approach should be continued in 1968, the leadership and program development training in technical education supported by the federal funds and national advisory services should be continued, and that institutes should be planned and organized around fewer topics of most critical need. (HC)
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INTRODUCTION

Need for the Project

State and local leadership development at all levels of technical education programming is essential to the sound and continuous growth of technical education in America. This leadership need has been clearly identified as a high priority by professional advisory groups and committees representing both state and local government and the profession in general.

The need for administrative leadership in technical education was further defined as the prime concern of administrative, supervisory, and teacher education representatives from 46 states represented at the five National Leadership Development Institutes in Technical Education held in 1966. Those in attendance indicated that a serious shortage of trained leadership personnel was probably the most critical factor impeding the growth and development of technical education in their state.

The National Program Development Institutes conducted during the summer of 1967 were a refined continuation of the 1966 summer technical education institutes. The 1967 institutes were designed to meet the demand to improve program development in technical education at both the state and local levels. Further, the institutes provided a mechanism for implementing positive program change through leadership development.

Purpose of the Project

The purpose of the project was to develop and improve the understanding of the philosophy of technical education and the specific leadership role and how it relates to program planning, implementation, evaluation and continued leadership training activities at the state and local levels through in-service training programs. The two specific groups served were: newly appointed administrators of technician training programs, and those with administrative responsibility for vocational areas which relate to technical education; and experienced state supervisory staff with a direct responsibility for administration of technical education programs or for training technical teachers.

Objectives

The specific objectives of the project were as follows:

A. To provide a vehicle for the development and improvement of present and prospective leaders, relatively inexperienced in the field of Technical Education, by developing
their understanding of the administrative leadership role in Technical Education, and how this role relates to long range program planning development, program implementation and evaluation, philosophy, projections, innovation, and the relationships of Technical Education to other disciplines.

B. To provide a mechanism whereby existing and potential Technical Education leadership personnel at the state level, relatively experienced in the field of Technical Education, will develop and improve their understanding of the administrative role of state supervisory and teacher education staff and how these roles specifically relate to program planning and evaluation, and the planned development of Technical Education leadership potential within their state through in-service training.

C. To provide an exemplary in-service leadership development and training program that will serve as a model for the development and implementation of similar programs at both the state and local levels, and thus develop the Technical Education leadership potential within the individual states.

Project Organization

The National Program Development Institutes in Technical Education was a consortium of the following institutions: The University of California at Los Angeles, The University of Connecticut, Mississippi State University, Utah State University, and The Center for Vocational and Technical Education, The Ohio State University.

The Center served as the coordinating agency for designing the program, obtaining funds, preparing the core of institute staff, recommending consultants, collecting, preparing and disseminating instructional materials, recruiting and selecting participants, evaluation activities, and preparing the final report.

Each of the four cooperating institutions sponsored a two-week institute with a pre-established leadership training program for thirty to forty participants. These institutes and their locations were as follows:

1. Two General Leadership Development Institutes held at Mississippi State University and Utah State University were similar in scope, content, and objectives to the five National
Leadership Development Institutes in Technical Education conducted during 1966. The General Leadership Development Institutes were built around the successful content of the previous institutes, and a comprehensive evaluation of these efforts provided for the refinement of the prior program content to meet the needs of the neophyte and the potential administrator with Technical Education responsibility.

2. Two State Staff Development Institutes held at the University of California at Los Angeles and the University of Connecticut focused upon the specific Technical Education Leadership needs at the state level in the following ways:

   A. by expanding and building upon previous institute training materials which were determined to have the most significant impact upon state staff development.

   B. by providing an exemplary program of in-service staff development which may be taken back to the states by institute participants to be implemented with the necessary adaptations to meet the particular needs of the state.
METHOD

The Method section of this report presents a description of the activities which initiated the institutes. It then presents other project activities in a chronological order, ending with a description of the development of supplemental materials, which was the last project activity.

Meeting of Leadership Institutes' Materials Development and Resource Committee

On September 29, 1966, a meeting of the Materials Development and Resource Committee was held in Chicago for the purpose of suggesting and identifying instructional materials and training aids that would be suitable for future Technical Education Leadership Development Institutes, and to make recommendations for the curricula and operation of future institutes. The participants at this meeting are listed in Appendix A-1.

The meeting was successful in structuring guidelines for future technical education leadership training activities. The committee emphasized the need, not only for a general type of Technical Education Leadership Development Institute for those relatively new to positions involving responsibility for technical education, but also the critical need for an institute designed specifically to help the experienced technical education person with state-wide responsibility to better understand and fulfill his state leadership role.

Evaluation of 1966 Leadership Development Institutes

A meeting to review and interpret the evaluation of the 1966 institutes was held at The Center on October 10 and 11, 1966. The meeting was attended by the 1966 institute directors, the recorder-evaluators, a representative from the Division of Vocational and Technical Education, U. S. Office of Education, and The Center staff concerned with the project. The institute directors and recorder-evaluators reviewed the institute evaluation results which had been prepared by the project staff. As a result of this meeting, many suggestions were made which served as a useful guide in planning the 1967 Leadership Development Institutes.

A copy of the program for the evaluation meeting and a list of participants are included in Appendix A-2 and A-4 respectively.
1967 Institute's Planning Committee

A meeting of prospective institute directors (or their representatives) and Center personnel involved in the project met at The Center on October 13-14, 1966, to plan the 1967 institutes. This Committee also emphasized the need for two types of institutes -- a general type of technical education leadership development institute and also an institute geared to help the more experienced technical education staff person with state-wide responsibility.

It was this committee's efforts, along with the two committees previously described, that generated ideas and materials that substantially assisted The Center staff in the preparation of an operational plan for the 1967 institutes.

Instructional Materials

A compilation of instructional materials generated by the 1966 institutes was reproduced for use in the 1967 institutes. These materials consisted of the following: Supplement I, consisting of four commissioned papers, a technical education bibliography, and new and revised informational resources; and Supplement II, a compilation of presentations by outstanding educators and industrialists who served as consultants for the five institutes held in 1966. In addition, The Center commissioned for three papers to be written which made up the Compilation of Technical Education Instructional Materials for the 1967 institutes. This Compilation consisted of the following commissioned papers:

1. "Technician Need Surveys"
   Dr. Herbert Righthand

2. "A Design for the Dynamic Leadership of Vocational Education in the Decade Ahead" Richard S. Nelson

3. "Intermediate and Long-Range Program Planning in Vocational-Technical Education"
   Dr. Joseph T. Nerden

Other materials prepared and supplied to each institute are listed in Appendix B.

Institute Planning Meeting

The institute directors (or assistant directors) attended a planning meeting at The Center on February 10-11, 1967. Several operational facets of the institutes were discussed, including:
1. institute budgets.
2. consultants and resource personnel for the institutes.
3. academic credit for participants.
4. sources of institute curriculum materials.
5. identification of resources and consultants for curriculum materials development.
6. institute publicity, recruitment, etc.
7. possible instruments and methodology for final institute evaluation.

The meeting was successful in arriving at operational procedures and in pinpointing needed resources that would contribute to the success of the institutes.

Recruitment of Participants

The recruitment effort consisted primarily of the announcement of the program development institutes through contact by mail and selected media.

Materials prepared and used in contacting prospective participants and announcing the institutes via the U. S. mail service consisted of a brochure, an application form, and a recommendation sheet. These materials were prepared by The Center staff, reviewed by the institute directors, revised, and then duplicated.

The announcement package was mailed to state directors of vocational and technical education, head state supervisors and teacher educators for all vocational and technical education services, and members of the American Technical Education Association. Announcements were also sent to the Chief Administrative Officer of institutions listed in the Technical Education Yearbook, to the 1966 institute participants and to prospective participants who made inquiry by mail and telephone. Approximately 5,000 persons received the set of materials in the recruitment effort.

Announcement of the institutes was also achieved through the following media:

- The American Technical Education Association Newsletter.
- The American Vocational Journal.
- The Technical Education News.
- The School Shop Magazine.
- The Industrial Arts and Vocational Education Journal.
- The American Association of Junior Colleges Occupational Newsletter.
Members of the Division of Vocational and Technical Education Staff of the U. S. Office of Education and Regional Field Offices assisted the recruitment effort by announcing the institutes at various national conferences and regional meetings.

The recruitment effort resulted in 270 applications being sent to the Admissions Committee. While this response provided an adequate number for participant selection, the number did not meet full expectations.

Participant Selection

The Admissions Committee, consisting of institute directors and Center staff met at The Center on May 17-18, 1967, reviewed the applications, and selected the participants and alternates for the four institutes. Preference was given to individuals who demonstrated leadership qualities or leadership potential and who were in a position to both benefit from the institute and assist with similar leadership training activities in their own states.

Of the 270 applicants, 122 were selected as participants for the institutes. The original plans were to accommodate 160 participants (40 per institute), however, limited funds made it necessary to limit the number of paid participants to 116 (29 per institute). Because of problems unanticipated at the time of application, some applicants withdrew themselves as candidates and were replaced by alternates. No attempt was made to analyze the biographical data of the applicants who were not selected as participants. However, detailed treatment of the biographical data of applicants selected as participants is presented in the project evaluation part of this report under Description of Participants.

Development of Evaluation Procedures and Instruments

The process of developing evaluation procedures and instruments was guided primarily by the first two objectives stated in the contract:

1. To provide a vehicle for the development and improvement of present and prospective leaders, relatively inexperienced in the field of Technical Education, by developing their understanding of the administrative leadership role in Technical Education, and how this role relates to long range program planning and development, program implementation and evaluation, philosophy, projections, innovations, and the relationships of Technical Education to other disciplines.

2. To provide a mechanism whereby existing and potential Technical Education leadership personnel at the state
level relatively experienced in the field of Technical Education, will develop and improve their understanding of the administrative role of state supervisory staff and how this role specifically relates to program planning and evaluation, and the planned development of Technical Education leadership potential within their state through in-service training.

Proposed instruments and procedures for evaluation were prepared by Center staff members and were reviewed by the institute directors, associate directors, and consultants. The final forms were then printed and distributed to the institutes.

Description of the Evaluation Instruments

Instruments were developed in keeping with the first two objectives of the institutes previously mentioned and were designed to determine the participant’s:

1. Gain in knowledge acquired from the institute.
2. Plans to utilize knowledge gained to affect positive program change.
3. Satisfaction with the content, presentation and operation of the institute.

In addition to the evaluation instruments, considerable personal data was obtained from the application forms including the name, age, address, present position, present duties and responsibilities of the applicant; professional and non-educational employment record; educational background; and long range goals of the applicant. This data provided an overview of the leadership potential in technical education, provided guidance for the institute directors on areas of content needing greatest stress, and provided guidelines for use in planning and evaluating future leadership training institutes.

The six instruments developed and used in the institutes are described below:

Participant’s Self-Appraisal - State Staff Institutes. -- The participant self-appraisal form for state staff institutes (Appendix C-1) was developed to be used as a pre-test and post-test evaluation instrument. This scale requested participants to assess their knowledge of selected topics at the beginning of the institutes and again at the end of the institutes. Each participant was asked to appraise his knowledge by using a five-point scale in which a rating of one meant that he did not feel knowledgeable concerning the topic and a rating of five meant that he felt highly knowledgeable concerning the topic. This instrument was developed to assess the gain in knowledge acquired by the participant from the institute.
Participant's Self-Appraisal - General Institutes.--The participant self-appraisal form for the general institutes (Appendix C-3) was similar in design and purpose to the participant self-appraisal form for the state staff institutes, except that more items were included in the instrument and the topic content of the items was somewhat different.

Participant's Present Program Activities.--Each participant was asked to complete this instrument (Appendix C-7) at the beginning of the institute. It was designed to determine the extent of the participants' involvement in a number of technical education activities. The instrument consisted of 20 items for which each participant indicated on a five-point scale the extent of present involvement. A rating of one meant that he was involved to a very low extent (or not at all) and a rating of five meant that he was involved to a very high extent.

Participant's Planned Program Activities.--This instrument (Appendix C-9) is the same in content and design as the one described above, and was administered at the end of the institutes. This time the participants were asked to indicate the extent they were planning to make any changes in their present program activities as a result of having attended the institute.

Evaluation of Presentations.--This instrument (Appendix C-11) was developed to assess the participants' evaluation of institute presentations on two occasions - on Friday of the first week and on Thursday of the second week. The participants were requested to evaluate six aspects of the presentation on a five-point scale (1 = poor, and 5 = excellent). The six aspects were quality of presentations, content of presentations, new concepts gained, quality of instructional materials, discussion opportunities, and variety of topics covered.

Participant's Professional Objectives.--This instrument (Appendix C-12) asked the participants to respond to a number of stated professional objectives by indicating whether they felt the objectives were either immediate (within the next two years) or long range objectives. Scores on this instrument were analyzed and interpreted as indicators of the success of the institutes. However, the data obtained will be used, primarily, in the follow-up of the participants to determine the extent to which they have reached their professional objectives.

Description of the Procedures for Evaluation

After the evaluation instruments had been developed, procedures for conducting the evaluation during the operation of the institutes were developed. These procedures may be examined in Appendix D.
Final Planning Meeting with Institute Directors

The final planning conference with the institute directors was held at Chicago on June 14, 1967. At this meeting, the instructional materials which had been prepared at The Center were presented for their review. The evaluation forms prepared by The Center staff were presented and critiqued. The group also reviewed the duties of the recorder-evaluators, and finalized the procedures for operating and evaluating the institutes.

Selection and Preparation of Recorder-Evaluators

The recorder-evaluators were graduate students selected by each institute director to assist with the administration of the institutes by recording activities and collecting data to be used in evaluating each institute and, subsequently, the total project. Each recorder-evaluator was provided with explicit instructions (Appendix D) prior to the institutes.

Operation of the Institutes

The General Leadership Development Institutes were conducted at the following universities on the indicated dates:

- Mississippi State University, July 10-21, 1967
- Utah State University, July 17-28, 1967

The State Staff Development Institutes were conducted at the following universities on the indicated dates:

- University of California at Los Angeles, July 17-28, 1967
- University of Connecticut, July 24 - August 4, 1967

The Instructional Programs.--The following major topics from the course outline (Appendix E-1) were covered at the General Leadership Development Institutes:

- The Leadership Role and Charge.
- The Rationale and Need for Technical Education.
- Description of the Technical Education Student.
- Administrative Structure of Technical Education Institutions.
- Program Patterns and Curriculum Development.
- Facilities and Equipment for Technical Education.
- Staffing Technical Education Programs.
Financing Technical Education.
Supervision and In-Service Teacher Education.
Establishing Research and Development Needs.

The following major topics from the course outline (Appendix E-6) were covered at the State Staff Development Institutes:

- Leadership - The Role and Responsibility.
- Technician Need Surveys.
- State and Local Resources for Program Support.
- Coordinating Technician Training with Other Vocational Areas.
- Publicizing New Technical Programs.
- Staffing for Supervisory Positions.
- Evaluating Technical Education Programs, Staff and Facilities.
- Reporting Systems and Data Handling.
- Research Responsibility.

There was no prescribed order or method of presentation of the topics. This was determined by the individual institutes. Flexibility allowed maximum utilization of available speakers, consultants, resource persons, and for the scheduling of field trips. A detailed program for each institute is provided in Appendix F.

Methods and Techniques.--In most instances, formal presentations by selected specialists and consultants were followed by group discussion, small group work, and individual study. A field trip was conducted at each institute to a nearby technical education institution or industrial laboratory. Visual aids were used extensively in all institutes. The specialists and consultants were drawn from education, industry, and government.

Daily Schedule.--The length of training for each of the four institutes was scheduled over a two-week period, beginning at 9:00 a.m. on Monday of the first week and ending at noon on Friday of the second week. A typical daily schedule for participants was as follows:
7:00 a.m. - 9:00 a.m. Breakfast, individual preparation, special interest group assignment activities.

9:00 a.m. - 10:30 a.m. Lecture or formal presentation by resource person.

10:30 a.m. - 12:00 n. Group discussion with resource person from previous session present.

12:00 n. - 1:00 p.m. Lunch

1:00 p.m. - 3:00 p.m. Group discussion led by institute director and usually with person or specialist other than morning speaker present.

3:00 p.m. - 4:30 p.m. Special interest group activity period -- may involve group discussion, group effort or structuring a report, preparing an item of material to be added to institute resources, or preparing outlines for state inservice leadership training plans.

4:30 p.m. - 5:30 p.m. Free time, group recreation, individual consultation with host institution staff specialists.

5:30 p.m. - 7:00 p.m. Dinner.

7:00 p.m. - 9:00 p.m. Library study, small group conferences with staff.

The field trip was scheduled for the entire day on the Saturday ending the first week of the institute.

Institute Staff.--In general, the institutes were staffed with a director or co-directors, assistant director, recorder-evaluator, selected consultants, and clerical personnel. A detailed staffing summary for the institutes is presented in Appendix G.

Attendance.--The institutes served 122 participants (114 men and 8 women) from 43 states, Puerto Rico, and Canada. The number of participants by institute was California, 29; Connecticut, 27; Mississippi, 34; and Utah, 32.

In all institutes, a certificate of attendance was given to each participant who completed the program. A detailed list of participants, by institute, is presented in Appendix H.
Evaluation.--The institute evaluation procedures (Appendix D-1) proved to be satisfactory to participants and institute directors and caused little confusion and/or delay in the operation of the institutes. Members of The Center project staff visited each of the institutes during their operation. This resulted in an exchange of information about the operation of the institutes and was valuable in total project evaluation.

Project Evaluation

The project evaluation was both objective and subjective in nature and was designed primarily to determine the participant's:

1. Gain in knowledge acquired from the institute.
2. Plans to utilize knowledge gained to affect positive program change.
3. Satisfaction with the content, presentation and operation of the institute.

Data used in evaluating the institutes were collected from the four participating institutes and were derived from the instruments below:

- The application form for participants.
- The participant's self-appraisal form for the state staff institutes as a pre-test and post-test (Appendix C-1).
- The participant's self-appraisal form for the general institutes as a pre-test and post-test (Appendix C-3).
- The participant's present program activities form (Appendix C-7).
- The participant's planned program activities form (Appendix C-9).
- Evaluation of presentations form (Appendix C-11).
- The participant's professional objectives form (Appendix C-12).

Electronic data processing equipment was used in the data reduction. The programs selected to process the data were determined by analyzing the previously stated objectives for the project evaluation. A description of electronic data processing programs and the procedures are presented in the following paragraphs.

Description of Participants.--The biographical data, which were collected on participants through the application form
were analyzed to obtain a description of participants in terms of:

- Regional representation.
- State representation.
- Age grouping.
- Sex grouping.
- Institutional classification.
- Present position classification.
- Length of service in present position.
- Professional education work experience (years).
- Non-educational work experience classification.
- Non-educational work experience (years).
- Highest degree earned.
- Degree major area.
- Type of institute applied for.
- Participant's capability to be self-supporting.

**Participant's Gain in Knowledge.** To obtain a measure of the participant's gain in knowledge, for each classification group in the Participant's Self-Appraisal (pre-test and post-test), a frequency count and a percentage response for each response level for each question was requested. A comparison of the responses of participants between the two test administrations (pre-test and post-test) to the same question was also obtained. The Ohio State Questionnaire Analysis was used and included:

- A comparison for each item on the questionnaire, the mean answer of both groups, and the difference of the means.
- The Kolmogorov-Smirnov Statistic.
- The Chi-square approximation and significance level for each item.

The following kinds of scores were obtained by processing data from the participant's self-appraisal instrument:

- Summary of the average pre-test scores for the state staff institutes.
Summary of the average post-test scores for the state staff institutes.

Participant's average gain score from pre-test to post-test for state staff institutes.

Average percentage of gain by participants from pre-test to post-test for state staff institutes.

\[
\text{Percent gain} = \frac{\text{Post-Test} - \text{Pre-Test}}{\text{Pre-Test Score}}
\]

Average percentage of gain by participants from pre-test to post-test by present position classification for state staff institutes.

Summary of the average pre-test scores for the general institutes.

Summary of the average post-test scores for the general institutes.

Participants' average gain score from pre-test to post-test for general institutes.

Average percentage of gain by participants from pre-test to post-test for general institutes.

\[
\text{Percent gain} = \frac{\text{Post-Test} - \text{Pre-Test}}{\text{Pre-Test Score}}
\]

Average percentage of gain by participants from pre-test to post-test by present position classifications for general institutes.

The following kinds of scores were obtained by processing data from the participants' present and planned program activities instruments:

Average absolute change score by item from pre-test to post-test (present to planned activities score) by institute.

Average percentage of change by participants from pre-test to post-test (present to planned activities score) by institute.

\[
\text{Percent change} = \frac{\text{Post-Test} - \text{Pre-Test}}{\text{Pre-Test Score}}
\]

Average absolute change score per item by present position classification and by activity clusters.

Average percentage of change by present position classification and by activity clusters.
To obtain other evaluation data, the following kinds of participants scores were summarized:

- Participant's evaluation of institute presentations - first week and second week.
- Participant's professional objectives by present position classification.

Review of Evaluation.—The project evaluation conference was held at The Center on October 12 and 13, 1967. The meeting was attended by the institute directors and The Center staff concerned with the project. The evaluation results were reviewed, which included all the findings of the data analysis previously described in this section of the report. Existing instructional materials were reviewed and evaluated and recommendations were made for the preparation of additional materials. Recommendations were also made for possible changes in the operation of future institutes. Facets of The Center's role as the coordinating institution for the consortium approach were also reviewed. A copy of the program for the evaluation meeting and a list of participants are included in Appendix I.

Preparation of Additional Instructional Materials

Through the experience of the institutes and the project evaluation meeting, the institute directors and Center staff identified instructional resources which were needed but not a part of existing materials.

The Project Evaluation Committee recommended that additional instructional materials be prepared and distributed to the institute participants and staff for use in conducting future state and locally sponsored leadership development institutes in technical education. In compliance with these suggestions, the following materials were compiled: (a) selected papers presented in the four institutes; (b) an ERIC package presentation including transparency masters and script; and (c) a compilation of facilities layouts for vocational and technical education.
RESULTS

The results of the project evaluation are presented in the following tables:

Description of Participants

Regional representation.--Table 1 indicates the distribution of participants who attended the four National Leadership Development Institutes in Technical Education and the total number of applicants by USOE region. The attendance ranged from a high of 29 from Region V to a low of 6 from Regions I and VIII. The total number of applicants ranged from a high of 77 for Region V to a low of 12 for Region VIII.

TABLE 1
GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRIBUTION OF PARTICIPANTS AND APPLICANTS BY USOE REGIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
<th>Total Number of Applicants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>* 120</td>
<td>** 264</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* In addition, there were 2 non-paid observers from Canada, making a total of 122 participants.

** There were 6 applicants outside of USOE Regions, making a total of 270 applicants.
State representation at all four institutes.--Table 2 shows the distribution of participants who attended the four institutes by state and territory. An examination of geographic mix of participants indicates that 43 states, Puerto Rico and Canada were represented. The 7 states not represented were Alaska, Hawaii, Maryland, New Hampshire, South Dakota, Vermont, and Wyoming. The number of participants by state ranged from a high of 9 for Michigan to a low of 1 for Delaware, Georgia, Idaho, Louisiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Mississippi, Montana, New Jersey North Dakota, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island, and Utah.

TABLE 2

GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRIBUTION OF ALL PARTICIPANTS BY STATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

State representation at general institutes.--The number of participants by state who attended the two general institutes at Utah and Mississippi is shown in Table 3. A total of 66 participants representing 35 states and Canada attended these two institutes. Michigan had the highest representation with 5, while a number of states had only 1 participant.

**TABLE 3**

GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRIBUTION OF GENERAL INSTITUTE PARTICIPANTS BY STATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>66</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

State representation at state staff institutes.--The number of participants by state who attended the two state staff institutes at California and Connecticut is indicated in Table 4. A total of 56 participants from 29 states, Puerto Rico and Canada attended these two institutes. The state with the largest representation was Wisconsin with 6, while a number of states were represented by only 1 participant.
TABLE 4

GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRIBUTION OF STATE STAFF INSTITUTE PARTICIPANTS BY STATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>56</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Age grouping.--Table 5 presents a summary of the age grouping of the participants. The greatest representation (30) was in the two age groups 40-44 and 45-49. The lowest representation (3) was in the youngest category, 25 to 29. One participant failed to report his age.

TABLE 5

DISTRIBUTION OF PARTICIPANTS BY AGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Age Grouping</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55 and over</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 54</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 - 49</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 44</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 - 39</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 34</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>121</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sex classification.--Table 6 reveals that of the 122 participants, 114 were male and 8 were female.

TABLE 6
DISTRIBUTION OF PARTICIPANTS BY SEX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
<td>94.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>122</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Institutional classification.--The number of participants associated with different types of institutions is presented in Table 7. Twenty-one participants were from universities or colleges, 26 were from community or junior colleges, 23 were from technical institutes, 8 were from area vocational-technical schools, 6 were from technical high schools, 9 were from comprehensive high schools, and 28 were from other types of institutions not classified above (state departments of education, etc.). Institutional classification data was not available for 1 participant.

TABLE 7
DISTRIBUTION OF PARTICIPANTS BY INSTITUTIONAL CLASSIFICATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution Classification</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University or College</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community or Junior College</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Institute</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Vocational-Technical School</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical High School</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Comprehensive</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>121</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Present position classification.—Table 8 reveals that of the 122 participants, 52 were in state or local administration, 24 were in state or local supervision, 21 were in instruction, 2 were in curriculum, 6 were in teacher education, and 17 were not classified under any of these headings.

### TABLE 8

**DISTRIBUTION OF PARTICIPANTS BY POSITION CLASSIFICATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position Classification</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>40.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Head</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>122</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Length of service in present position.—Table 9 indicates the number of years each participant had served in his present position. Of the 89 participants from which this data was collected, 58 were in the 1-3 year category, 19 were in the 4-7 year category, 4 were in the 8-11 year category, 3 were in the 12-15 year category, and 5 were in the 16 and over category. Thirty-three participants did not provide this information on their application forms.

### TABLE 9

**DISTRIBUTION OF PARTICIPANTS BY LENGTH OF SERVICE IN PRESENT POSITION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Service in Present Position</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
<td>65.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 7</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - 11</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 - 15</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 and over</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Professional education work experience in years.—Table 10 indicates that of the 117 participants, 10 were in the 1-5 year range, 32 were in the 6-10 year range, 22 were in the 11-15 year range, 35 were in the 16-20 year range, and 18 were in the 21 and over range. Five participants did not provide professional education work experience data in their applications.

**TABLE 10**

**DISTRIBUTION OF PARTICIPANTS BY PROFESSIONAL WORK EXPERIENCE IN YEARS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Professional Education Work Experience</th>
<th>Participants Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 20</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 and over</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>117</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Non-educational work experience classification.—The categories of the participants non-educational work experience are shown in Table 11. Of the 112 participants who revealed this information, 49 had experience in industry, 8 in business, 4 in distributive occupations, 3 in health, 13 in technical occupations, 15 in engineering and/or scientific job classifications, and 20 indicated some area other than those above. Ten participants did not provide this data in their applications.

**TABLE 11**

**DISTRIBUTION OF PARTICIPANTS BY NON-EDUCATIONAL WORK EXPERIENCE CLASSIFICATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Educational Work Experience Classification</th>
<th>Participants Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>43.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering and Scientific</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>112</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Non-educational work experience in years.--Table 12 shows that the participants' non-educational work experience in years was broken into 5 major categories. A total of 111 participants were included in the analysis; 16 were in the 1-3 year category, 41 were in the 4-7 year category, 23 were in the 8-11 year category, 20 were in the 12-15 year category, and 16 were in the 16 and over category. Eleven applicants did not provide non-educational work experience data in their applications.

TABLE 12
DISTRIBUTION OF PARTICIPANTS BY NON-EDUCATIONAL WORK EXPERIENCE IN YEARS - (LAST 4 JOBS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Non-Educational Work Experience - Last 4 Jobs</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 7</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - 11</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 - 15</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 and over</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Highest degree earned.--Table 13 reveals that of the 120 participants for which data were collected, 9 held the Ph.D. or Ed.D., 90 held a master's degree, and 21 held a bachelor's degree. Degree data were not available on 2 application forms.

TABLE 13
DISTRIBUTION OF PARTICIPANTS BY HIGHEST DEGREE EARNED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest Degree Earned</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D. or Ed.D.</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.S. or B.A.</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Associate degree major area.--Table 14 reveals that 8 of the participants indicated their associate degree major area. Of these, 1 was in agriculture, 2 in engineering, 2 in technical, 1 in trade and industrial, and 2 in some area other than those above. The remaining 114 participants either did not receive the associate degree, or did not provide this data in their applications.

TABLE 14

DISTRIBUTION OF PARTICIPANTS BY ASSOCIATE DEGREE MAJOR AREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Associate Degree Major Area</th>
<th>Participants Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade and Industrial</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B.S. or B.A. degree major area.--Table 15 shows a breakdown of the participants' B.S. or B.A. degree major area. Of the 121 participants who revealed this information, 6 received their B.S. or B.A. in agriculture, 11 in business, 1 in distributive, 4 in health, 12 in math-science, 13 in industrial arts, 4 in technical, 31 in trade and industrial, and 39 received their degree in some area other than those above. This data was not available for 1 participant.

TABLE 15

DISTRIBUTION OF PARTICIPANTS BY B.S. OR B.A. DEGREE MAJOR AREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B.S. or B.A. Degree Major Area</th>
<th>Participants Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math-Science</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Arts</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade and Industrial</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>32.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>121</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Master's degree major area.--Table 16 indicates the master's degree major area of 100 participants: 13 received their master's degree in administration, 5 in business, 22 in trade and industrial, 10 in engineering, 5 in math-science, 5 in technical, 13 in vocational, and 27 in an area other than those indicated above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Master's Degree Major Area</th>
<th>Participants Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Education (T &amp; I)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math-Science</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ph.D. or Ed.D. major area.--Table 17 reveals the Ph.D. or Ed.D. major area of the 9 participants who held this degree. Four received their degree in administration, 1 in trade and industrial, 1 in technical, 2 in vocational, and 1 in some other category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ph.D. or Ed.D. Major Area</th>
<th>Participants Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Education (T &amp; I)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Type of institute applied for.--The type of institute that the participants applied for is shown in Table 18. Sixty-two participants applied for a general institute, 43 applied for a state staff institute, and the remainder (17) applied for either a general institute or a state staff institute.

TABLE 18
DISTRIBUTION OF PARTICIPANTS BY TYPE OF INSTITUTE APPLIED FOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Institute Applied for</th>
<th>Participants Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>50.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Staff</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Either</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>122</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participants' Gain in Knowledge

The results of the analysis of data on several facets of the participants' gain in knowledge are presented in the following tables:

Summary of the average pre-test raw score (participant's self-appraisal) for state staff institutes.--Table 19 indicates that the average pre-test raw score (participant's self appraisal) for the state staff institutes was 74.14. The possible raw score range was from 25 to 125. The average pre-test scores by institute were: California--77.17 and Connecticut--71.11.

TABLE 19
SUMMARY OF AVERAGE PRE-TEST SCORES (PARTICIPANT'S SELF APPRAISAL) FOR STATE STAFF INSTITUTES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Pre-Test Score for State Staff Institutes</th>
<th>Average Pre-Test Score by Institute</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>74.14</td>
<td>California 77.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Connecticut 71.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of the average post-test raw score for state staff institutes.--Table 20 indicates that the average post-test raw score (participant's self-appraisal) for the state staff institutes was 85.56. The possible raw score range was from 25 to 125. The scores by institute were: California--85.31 and Connecticut--85.81.

TABLE 20

SUMMARY OF AVERAGE POST-TEST SCORES FOR STATE STAFF INSTITUTES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Post-Test Score for State Institutes</th>
<th>Average Post-Test Score by Institute</th>
<th>California</th>
<th>Connecticut</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>85.56</td>
<td></td>
<td>85.31</td>
<td>85.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participants' average gain in raw score from pre-test to post-test for state staff institutes.--Table 21 indicates that the average gain in raw score (participant's self-appraisal) from the pre-test to the post-test for the state staff institutes was 11.42. The average gain scores by institute were: California--8.14 and Connecticut--14.70.

TABLE 21

GAIN SCORE AVERAGE FROM PRE-TEST TO POST-TEST FOR STATE STAFF INSTITUTES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gain Score Average for State Institutes</th>
<th>Gain Score Average by Institute</th>
<th>California</th>
<th>Connecticut</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11.42</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.14</td>
<td>14.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average percentage of gain by participants from pre-test to post-test for state staff institutes.--Table 22 indicates that the average percentage of gain by participants for the state staff institutes was 15.22 percent. The average percent of gain from the pre-test to post-test (participant's self-appraisal) was 10.55 percent for California and 20.68 percent for Connecticut.

TABLE 22

AVERAGE PERCENT OF GAIN BY PARTICIPANTS FROM PRE-TEST TO POST-TEST FOR STATE STAFF INSTITUTES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Percent of Gain for State Institutes</th>
<th>Average Percent Gain by Institute</th>
<th>California</th>
<th>Connecticut</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15.22</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.55</td>
<td>20.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Average percentage of gain by participants from pre-test to post-test by present position classification for state staff institutes.---

Table 23 reveals the average percent gain from the pre-test to post-test for the state staff institute participants by their present position classification. The average percent of gain by position classification was: department heads or chairmen -- 18.15 percent; teacher educators -- 29.95 percent; local directors -- 16.06 percent; local supervisors -- 5.71 percent; state supervisors -- 13.36 percent; administrators in post high schools -- 13.92 percent; and those in positions classified as "other" -- 10.70 percent.

**TABLE 23**

**AVERAGE PERCENT OF GAIN BY PARTICIPANTS**
**FROM PRE-TEST TO POST-TEST BY PRESENT POSITION**
**CLASSIFICATION FOR STATE STAFF INSTITUTES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position Classification</th>
<th>No. of Participants</th>
<th>Average Percent Gain for State Staff Institutes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. Head or Chairman</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Educator</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Director</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Supervisor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Supervisor</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator in Post-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of the average pre-test raw score (participant's self-appraisal) for general institutes.---Table 24 indicates that the average pre-test raw score (participant's self-appraisal) for the general institutes was 137.41. The possible raw score range was from 50 to 250. The average pre-test scores by institute were 135.53 for Mississippi and 139.28 for Utah.

**TABLE 24**

**SUMMARY OF AVERAGE PRE-TEST SCORES**
**PARTICIPANTS SELF-APPRaisal FOR GENERAL INSTITUTES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Pre-Test Score for General Institutes</th>
<th>Average Pre-Test Score by Institute Mississippi</th>
<th>Average Pre-Test Score by Institute Utah</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>137.41</td>
<td>135.53</td>
<td>139.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Summary of the average post-test raw score for general institutes.—Table 25 indicates that the average post-test raw score (participant's self-appraisal) for the general institutes was 183.86. The possible raw score range was from 50 to 250. The average post-test scores by institute were 186.06 for Mississippi and 181.66 for Utah.

**TABLE 25**

**SUMMARY OF AVERAGE POST-TEST SCORES (PARTICIPANTS SELF-APPRAISAL) FOR GENERAL INSTITUTES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Post-Test Score for General Institutes</th>
<th>Average Post-Test Score by Institute Mississippi</th>
<th>Utah</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>183.86</td>
<td>186.06</td>
<td>181.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Average percentage of gain by participants from pre-test to post-test by present position classification for general institutes. Table 28 reveals the average percent gain from the pre-test to post-test for the general institute participants by their present position classification. The average percent of gain by position classification was: teachers -- 31.67 percent; department heads or chairmen -- 20.53 percent; teacher educators -- 30.53 percent; local directors -- 40.98 percent; local supervisors -- 49.11 percent; state supervisors -- 26.34 percent; administrators in post-high schools -- 33.31 percent; and those in positions classified as "other" -- 31.56 percent.

TABLE 28

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position Classification</th>
<th>No. of Participants</th>
<th>Average Percent Gain for General Institutes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. Head or Chairman</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Educator</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Director</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>40.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Supervisor</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>49.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Supervisor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator in Post</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>33.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>31.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participant's Present and Planned Activities

All participants completed an instrument on the first day of the institutes which indicated the extent of their involvement in a number of technical education activities. The instrument consisted of 20 items for which the participants indicated on a 5-point scale the extent of present involvement (1 = very low extent or not at all, 2 = low extent, 3 = average extent, 4 = high extent and 5 = very high extent).

The same instrument was administered at the end of the institutes, except this time the participants indicated the extent they were planning to make any changes in their present program activities as a result of having attended the institute.

Since any change from present to planned program activities was assumed to be positive, the data were analyzed in terms of absolute change.
The following tables present the results of the analysis of data:

Average absolute change score by item from pre-test to post-test (present to planned activities score) by institute. Table 29 indicates the average absolute change score (1-5 scale) for each item from the pre-test to post-test (present to planned activities score) by institute. The average change score by item by institute was: California -- 1.04; Connecticut -- 1.22; Mississippi -- 1.05; and Utah 1.09.

**TABLE 29**

**AVERAGE ABSOLUTE CHANGE SCORE BY ITEM FROM PRE-TEST TO POST-TEST (PRESENT TO PLANNED ACTIVITIES SCORE) BY INSTITUTE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institute</th>
<th>Average Absolute Raw Change Score by Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average percentage of change by participants from pre-test to post-test (present to planned activities score) by institute. Table 30 indicates the average percentage of change by participants from the pre-test to post-test (present to planned activities score) by institute. The average percent change by institute was 34.98 percent for California, 42.23 percent for Connecticut, 37.90 percent for Mississippi and 38.23 percent for Utah.

**TABLE 30**

**AVERAGE PERCENT OF CHANGE BY PARTICIPANTS FROM PRE-TEST TO POST-TEST (PRESENT TO PLANNED ACTIVITIES SCORE) BY INSTITUTE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institute</th>
<th>Average Percent of Change of Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>34.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>42.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>37.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>38.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participants' Evaluation of Institute Presentations

The institute participants evaluated the institute presentations on two occasions -- on Friday of the first week and on Thursday of the second week. Six aspects of the presentations were evaluated on a 5-point scale (1 = poor, and 5 = excellent). The six aspects were (1) quality of presentations, (2) content of presentations, (3) new concepts gained, (4) quality of instructional materials, (5) discussion opportunities, and (6) variety of topics covered.

The following tables present a summary of the participants' evaluation of presentations:

Summary of the average first week evaluation scores.--Table 31 indicates that the average first week evaluation score for all institutes was 23.31. The possible range was from 6 to 30 (6 = poor and 30 = excellent). The average first week evaluation scores by institute were: California -- 21.86; Connecticut -- 25.48; Mississippi -- 24.16; and Utah -- 21.75.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average 1st Week Evaluation Score for all Institutes</th>
<th>Average 1st Week Evaluation Score by Institute</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23.31</td>
<td>Calif. 21.86 Conn. 25.48 Miss. 24.16 Utah 21.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of the average second week evaluation scores.--Table 32 indicates that the average second week evaluation score for all institutes was 24.27. The possible range was from 6 to 30 (6 = poor, and 30 = excellent). The average second week evaluation score was 21.55 for California, 25.52 for Connecticut, 26.56 for Mississippi and 23.44 for Utah.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average 2nd Week Evaluation Score for all Institutes</th>
<th>Average 2nd Week Evaluation Score by Institute</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24.27</td>
<td>Calif. 21.55 Conn. 25.52 Miss. 26.56 Utah 23.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Summary of the average first week and second week evaluation scores.--Table 33 indicates that the average first week and second week evaluation score for all institutes was 23.79. The possible range was from 6 to 30 (6 = poor, and 30 = excellent). The average first week and second week evaluation scores by institute were: California -- 21.71; Connecticut -- 25.50; Mississippi -- 25.36; and Utah -- 22.60.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average 1st Week and 2nd Week Evaluation Score for all Institutes</th>
<th>Average 1st Week and 2nd Week Evaluation Score by Institute</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23.79</td>
<td>Calif.  Conn. Miss. Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21.71  25.50  25.36  22.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Review of Evaluation

The members of the project evaluation committee discussed all aspects of the previously mentioned evaluation results as well as other factors such as the consortium approach and the coordination of the project. The institute directors were pleased with the growth on the part of the participants in terms of their gain in technical education knowledge. The evidence also indicated that the participants planned to make numerous changes in their programs as a result of having attended the institutes, and that the participants were satisfied with the institute presentations.

The institute directors complimented the consortium approach and recommended continuation of this technique for conducting program development training institutes in technical education. The Center staff and the institute directors reviewed and evaluated existing instructional materials and recommended the preparation of additional instructional materials to be supplied to the institute participants and staff for use in conducting future state and locally sponsored leadership training programs in technical education.

The following recommendations were also made for consideration in planning and conducting future institutes:

- The geographical location of future institutes should provide optimum transportation accessibility.
- The institute program should be planned and organized around fewer topics so that the most critical needs of participants can be explored in depth.
- Attempts should be made to employ outstanding consultants for longer periods of time to provide for better coordination and to insure greater in-depth treatment of institute topics.
- Participants should be reimbursed for travel and subsistence.
- Overhead money should be provided to the sponsoring institutions to encourage greater participation by leading centers of learning currently hampered by the present regulations.
- The institute directors recommended that The Center develop plans to conduct leadership development institutes in 1968.
DISCUSSION

Interpretation of the results for each part of the evaluation have been presented in the Discussion section in the same order that they appeared in the Results section of this report.

Description of Participant

Representation by U. S. Office of Education Regions.--The selection process resulted in an equitable distribution of participants and alternates among the U. S. Office of Education Regions. The number of participants from Regions I, II, and VIII was somewhat lower than the number from other regions; however, the lack of extensive technical education programs in these regions may account for the low attendance from these states. Overall, the institute directors and the Center staff were pleased with the regional distribution of participants attending the institutes.

Representation by state.--The attempt to obtain a geographic mix of participants was successful. An insufficient number of applicants from several states, however, resulted in seven states not being represented, and 13 states having only one participant. Several factors are likely to be responsible for the poor attendance from these states. Many of the states have a limited population and their technical education programs are in the developmental stages. Some states probably had limited participation because of the time of year the institutes were conducted. It is also probable that many technical educators had already committed themselves to other special professional activities prior to the announcement of the institutes. Other institutes that provide full travel and subsistence could have influenced potential applicants.

Age grouping.--Almost one-half of the participants were in the 40-49 age range, which is an indication of the average age of many technical education leaders. However, the age of the participant was not a critical factor in selecting qualified leaders or potential leaders for attendance at the institutes.

Sex classification.--Because of the lack of women applicants, only eight of the 122 participants were female. However, applications from qualified female administrators, state and local supervisors, teacher educators, and other female leadership personnel were actively solicited during the application period.

Institutional classification.--The greatest representation to the institutes was from the post-high school institutions. This might be explained by the fact that most technical education is offered in institutions at the post-high school level. Future institutes may have an increase in participants from high schools as more technical programs are developed at that level.
Present position classification.--The participants' application forms revealed that the greatest number of participants (75) were employed in administrative or supervisory positions at the state or local level. Other areas were adequately represented with the exception of curriculum personnel.

Length of service in present position.--Almost one-half (58) of the participants had only served from one to three years in their present position, and 19 more had spent only 4-7 years in their present position. This is an indication of the newness of many technical education programs, and the mobility of technical education administrators.

Professional education work experience in years.--The participant's professional education work experience represented the number of years in their last four positions. This included teaching, supervisory, administrative, teacher education, and curriculum development experience. The larger groups were those in the 6-10, 11-15, and 16-20 years of experience categories. This might be explained by the fact that present day administrators normally come from the ranks of the profession, and therefore have appropriate previous professional backgrounds.

Non-educational work experience classification.--The greatest representation of non-educational work experience (49) was from industry. This can best be explained by the certification requirement for most teaching and administrative jobs in technical education which require appropriate occupational experience and the fact that most existing technical education programs are industrial oriented.

Non-educational work experience in years.--The greater number of participants (41) had from 4-7 years of work experience which may again be explained by the fact that most technical education administrators must meet state certification requirements. In general, these requirements stipulate a minimum of at least five years of work experience. It is significant to note, however, that 16 of the participants had only 1-3 years of non-educational work experience. This can be explained in part by the fact that many of the participants came to the institute from community or junior colleges which have varied requirements for certification. In fact, some states have no rigid certification requirements for professional personnel employed in these community or junior colleges.

Highest degree earned.--A majority of the participants (90) held the master's degree. This could be explained by the fact that
certification requirements for most administrative positions require the completion of the master's degree.

Associate degree major area.--There were eight participants who indicated their associate degree major area. The areas represented included agriculture, engineering, technical, trade and industrial and "other". It may be that other participants had received an associate degree, but did not report this information on their application forms.

B.S. or B.A. degree major area.--The data revealed a wide variety in the B.S. or B.A. degree major areas of the participants. The most representative area was Trade and Industrial Education.

Master's degree major area.--A great variety of degree major areas existed among the 100 participants who held the master's degree. Trade and Industrial Education was well represented, as were the areas of Educational Administration, Vocational Education and Engineering.

Ph.D. or Ed.D. major area.--Of the nine participants with the doctorate degree, four had received the degree in Administration. Other areas represented were Trade and Industrial Education, Technical Education, Vocational Education and the area classified as "other".

Type of institute applied for.--About one-half (62) of the participants applied for a general institute, while 43 applied for a state staff institute and 17 indicated they would attend either type. This information was helpful in the selection process.

Participants' Gain in Knowledge

The interpretation of the participants' gain in knowledge is treated in the following paragraphs:

Summary of the average pre-test raw score (participant's self-appraisal) for state staff institutes.--The average pre-test score (participant's self appraisal), for the state staff institutes was 74.14. These pre-test scores are directly related to the knowledge the participants brought with them. The institute having the lowest average pre-test score had the greatest overall average percentage of gain.

Summary of the average post-test raw score for state staff institutes.--Although the participants (and hence the institutes) pre-test scores varied widely, the average post-test score (participant's self-appraisal) for the two state staff institutes was very similar. This would indicate that, regardless of the diversity of background and level of the participants, the institutes were uniformly effective in raising the level of the participants to some similar degree of understanding.

Participants average gain in raw score from pre-test to post-test for state staff institutes.--The average gain score indicates
that the participants in each institute experienced a gain in knowledge. It is assumed that the gain was a direct result of participation in the institutes.

**Average percentage of gain by participants from pre-test to post-test for state staff and general institutes.**--While the results reveal that some of the institutes had considerably higher average percentages of gain than others, gain used by itself for the evaluation of the institutes is a tenuous criterion. The procedures used for selecting participants for the institutes did not provide for categorizing by professional education attainment or by professional education work experience. Therefore, it is possible for the most capable and experienced participants to cluster in the institutes showing the lowest average percentage of gain. If this is the case, then one might assume that this group came to their respective institute better prepared and qualified than their counterparts in other institutes. Therefore, the institute that had the highest pre-test score would tend to show a lower average percentage of gain. Conversely, the greatest average percentage of gain by a given institute's participants might be caused by the grouping of participants who, by chance, were less qualified by educational background and professional work experience.

**Average percentage of gain by participants from pre-test to post-test by present position classification for state staff institutes.**--As a group, teacher educators had the highest average percent of gain, while local supervisors had the lowest average percent of gain. This might be explained by the fact that most of the teacher educators at this institute were from specific vocational areas other than technical education, while most of the local supervisors had broad responsibility in their jobs in several vocational-technical areas. This greater exposure to vocational-technical programming could be reflected in higher pre-test and hence lower gain scores for the local supervisors.

**Summary of the average pre-test raw score (participant's self-appraisal) for general institutes.**--As was true for the state staff institutes, the institute having the lowest average pre-test score had the greatest average percentage of gain.

**Summary of the average post-test raw score for general institutes.**--The institute with the lowest pre-test score also had the highest post-test score. Again, however, due to the existence of uncontrolled variables such as participant's age, experience, and professional education, one should not conclude that one institute was of better quality than the other.

**Participant's average gain in raw score from pre-test to post-test for general institutes.**--The average gain score reveals that the participants in each general institute experienced a gain
of knowledge. As would be expected, the participants in the general institutes experienced a greater proportionate gain in knowledge than those in the state staff institutes. In general, the participants in the general institutes were less experienced in technical education, therefore, had more room for growth than those attending the state staff institutes.

Average percentage of gain by participants from pre-test to post-test by position classification for general institutes.

In the general institutes local supervisors had the highest average percent of gain, while department heads or chairmen had the lowest average percent of gain. It is significant to note, however, that all groups showed a respectable average percent of gain. As was true for the state staff institutes, it is difficult to make valid explanations of the differences between groups because of the differences in the experience and background of participants in each category.

Participant's Present and Planned Activities

The following paragraphs present an interpretation of the data concerning the participant's present and planned program activities:

Average absolute change score by item from pre-test to post-test (present to planned activities score) by institute.

Analysis of data revealed that participants in each institute had an average absolute change score for each item of over 1.00. This means that for each item on a 5-point scale, the participants changed over one full unit from the pre-test to post-test (present to planned activities score). Any change from present to planned program activities was assumed to be positive change. This is an indication that the participants planned to implement positive program change as a result of the institutes. This is based on the assumption that the participant's change score on the instrument was a direct result of participation in the institutes.

Average percentage of change by participants from pre-test to post-test (present to planned activities score) by institute.

Each of the institutes experienced a respectable average percentage of change with the range being from 34.98 percent to 42.23 percent. These scores should not be used to compare the effectiveness of each institute in stimulating positive program change, since the data was highly subjective and due to the existence of uncontrolled variables such as the participant's age, experience, and professional education.

Participants' Evaluation of Institute Presentations

The results indicate that the participants were generally well pleased with the institute presentations. The presentations were evaluated on two occasions -- on Friday of the first week and on Thursday of the second week. Some participants felt it was difficult to give an average rating to all the presentations given during a
week's time, and would have preferred to evaluate each presentation separately. This should be considered in the operation of future institutes.

Review of Evaluation

The Project Evaluation Meeting provided results which required no analysis of hard data as in the case of other evaluation activities; consequently, there are no interpretations of results to be presented here. The reader is referred to the Results section of this report for the outcomes of the review of the evaluation which was the purpose of the Project Evaluation Meeting.
CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

The conclusions which have been developed are presented in the following statements:

1. The consortium approach which included program planning for the institutes, instructional materials preparation, recruitment and selection of participants, and project evaluation was successful.

2. The evaluation procedures and instruments functioned successfully without distraction for each of the institutes and were effective in achieving the stated objectives of evaluation.

3. All institutes were successfully conducted and well attended.

4. The institutes provided for a geographical mix of participants which promoted a valuable exchange of information about technical education.

5. There was a cross-sectional mix of service areas, institutional classifications and professional position classifications.

6. Most participants in all institutes experienced a commendable gain in knowledge. Although there were variations in gain scores from one institute to another, one cannot conclude that one institute was better than another due to the limitations of available data.

7. Institute participants were generally well pleased with the presentations and over-all operation of the institutes.

8. There was evidence that participants planned to implement positive program change as a result of having attended the institutes.

Implications

The implications of the findings and experience of this training project for planning and conducting similar projects in the future are outlined in the following:

1. The project evaluation indicated that there is a need to determine how to identify and attract greater numbers of qualified applicants.
2. Participant comments revealed that the method of evaluating institute presentations should be reviewed and refined.

3. The project evaluation indicated that the scheduling of future institutes should avoid conflict with other professional activities that could limit participation of potential enrollees.

Recommendations

Based on the experience of the four institutes conducted in 1967 and the project evaluation, (see Method Section) the following recommendations are offered regarding the nature and need for future training projects in technical education.

1. National Program Development Institutes should be continued in 1968 based on the success of the 1967 institutes and the expanded need for leaders in technical education.

2. The consortium approach to planning and conducting national institutes for program development should be continued.

3. Leadership and program development training in technical education, supported by federal funds and national advisory services should be continued.

4. The geographical location of future institutes should provide optimum transportation accessibility.

5. Participants should be reimbursed for travel and subsistence to attract greater numbers of qualified applicants.

6. Attempts should be made to employ outstanding consultants for longer periods of time to provide for better coordination and to insure greater in-depth treatment of institute topics.

7. The institute program should be planned and organized around fewer topics so that the most critical needs of participants can be explored in depth.

8. Overhead money should be provided to the sponsoring institutions to encourage greater participation by leading centers of learning currently hampered by the present regulations.
SUMMARY

The phenomenal nationwide growth in technical education, prompted by the demand for greater numbers of technicians, has brought about an increasing need for leadership personnel in technical education. The critical need for leadership has been expressed in many professional meetings and publications. Sound and continuous program growth in technical education hinges upon both the quantity and quality of leaders in the field. The National Program Development Institutes were a refinement of a series of summer institutes designed to meet this demand to improve the leadership and program development in technical education.

Project Description

The National Program Development Institutes in Technical Education was a training project conducted as a consortium effort involving four cooperating universities (The University of California at Los Angeles, The University of Connecticut, Mississippi State University and Utah State University) and The Center for Research and Leadership Development in Vocational and Technical Education, The Ohio State University (the institution hereinafter referred to as The Center), which served as the coordinating agency. Each of the four cooperating universities sponsored a two-week institute during the summer of 1967. The two General Leadership Development Institutes held at Mississippi State University and Utah State University were designed to meet the needs of those people relatively new to positions involving responsibility for Technical Education but with potential leadership ability. The two State Staff Development Institutes held at The University of California at Los Angeles and The University of Connecticut were designed specifically to help the experienced technical education person with state-wide responsibility to better understand and fulfill his state leadership role. The Center served as the coordinating agency for designing the program, obtaining support, collecting and preparing instructional materials, recruiting and selecting participants, preparing staff, evaluating the program, writing the final report, disseminating information, and following up participants.

Purpose of the Project

The purpose of the project was to provide the resources for the development of administrative leadership and further program development at state and local levels for both experienced and inexperienced technical education personnel.

Objectives of the Project

The specific objectives of the project were as follows:

1. To provide a vehicle for the development and improvement of present and prospective leaders, relatively inexperienced
in the field of Technical Education by developing their understanding of the administrative leadership role in Technical Education, and how this role relates to long range program planning development, program implementation and evaluation, philosophy, projections, innovations, and the relationships of Technical Education to other disciplines.

2. To provide a mechanism whereby existing and potential technical education leadership personnel at the state level, relatively experienced in the field of Technical Education, will develop and improve their understanding of the administrative role of state supervisory and teacher education staff and how these roles specifically relate to program planning and evaluation, and the planned development of technical education leadership potential within their state through in-service training.

3. To provide an exemplary in-service leadership development and training program that will serve as a model for the development and implementation of similar programs at both the state and local levels, and thus develop the technical education leadership potential within the individual states.

Method

The method undertaken in planning and implementing the project is described briefly in the following paragraphs:

Meeting of leadership institutes' materials development and resource committee.--This committee assisted The Center staff in identifying and developing instructional materials and training aids needed in the institutes, and helped to structure guidelines for the curricula and operation of the institutes.

Evaluation of 1966 leadership development institutes.--The evaluation of the five institutes conducted in the summer of 1966 resulted in many helpful guidelines for the planning of the 1967 institutes.

New institutes planning committee.--The prospective directors met with Center personnel to plan for the project. It was this committee's efforts, along with the two committee's described above, that generated ideas and materials to assist The Center staff substantially in the preparation of an operational plan for the institutes.

Instructional materials:--A compilation of instructional materials generated by the 1966 institutes was reproduced for use in the 1967 institutes. Supplement I consisted of four commissioned papers, a technical education bibliography, and new and
revised informational resources. Supplement II was a compilation of presentations by outstanding educators and industrialists who served as consultants for the five institutes held in 1966. The Center also commissioned for three papers to be written which made up the Compilation of Technical Education Instructional Materials for the 1967 institutes. Many other resource materials were prepared and distributed to the institutes.

Institute planning meeting.—The meeting of institute directors with The Center staff was successful in arriving at operational procedures and in pinpointing needed resources that would contribute to the success of the institutes.

Recruitment of participants.—Participants for the institutes were recruited through a centralized effort conducted by The Center. An announcement brochure, application form, and recommendation sheet were mailed to approximately 5,000 persons. As a result of the recruitment effort, which included the aforementioned mailing, announcements via articles in selected media, and presentations to national and regional conferences of vocational and technical educators, 270 applications were received by the Admissions Committee.

Selection of participants.—Since there were more than twice as many applicants as enrollment opportunities in the four institutes, a great amount of selectivity was possible. Preference was given to individuals who demonstrated leadership qualities or leadership potential and who were in a position to both benefit from the institute and also to assist with similar leadership training activities in their own states.

Development of evaluation procedures and instruments.—Procedures and instruments were prepared to comply with the evaluation objectives of the project. In addition to the participant’s application form which provided considerable biographical data, the following instruments were developed:

- Participant’s Self-Appraisal - State Staff Institutes.
- Participant’s Self-Appraisal - General Institutes.
- Participant’s Present Program Activities.
- Participant’s Planned Program Activities.
- Evaluation of Presentations.
- Participant’s Professional Objectives.

Final planning meeting with institute directors.—A final planning conference was held with the institute directors to review
the instructional materials, the evaluation forms and procedures, and other important matters concerning the operation of the institutes.

Selection and preparation of recorder-evaluators.--The recorder-evaluators were graduate students selected by each institute director to assist with the administration of the institutes by recording activities and collecting data to be used in evaluating each institute and the project. Each recorder-evaluator was provided with explicit instructions prior to the institutes.

Operation of the institutes.--The General Leadership Development Institutes were conducted at Mississippi State University on July 10-21, 1967 and at Utah State University on July 17-28, 1967.

The State Staff Development Institutes were conducted at the University of California at Los Angeles on July 17-28, 1967 and at the University of Connecticut on July 24 - August 4, 1967.

The program of the General Leadership Development Institutes included the following major topics:

- The Leadership Role and Charge.
- The Rationale and Need for Technical Education.
- Description of the Technical Education Student.
- Administrative Structure of Technical Education Institutions.
- Program Patterns and Curriculum Development.
- Facilities and Equipment for Technical Education.
- Staffing Technical Education Programs.
- Financing Technical Education.
- Supervision and In-service Teacher Education.
- Establishing Research and Development Needs.

The program of the State Staff Development Institutes included the following major topics:

- Leadership - The Role and Responsibility.
- Technician Need Surveys.
State and Local Resources for Program Support.

Coordinating Technician Training with other Vocational Areas.

Publicizing New Technical Programs.

Intermediate and Long Range Program Planning.

Staffing for Supervisory Positions.

Evaluating Technical Education Programs, Staff and Facilities.

Reporting Systems and Data Handling.

Research Responsibility.

There was no prescribed order or method of presentation of the topics. This was determined by the individual institutes. Flexibility allowed maximum utilization of available speakers, consultants, resource persons, and for the scheduling of field trips. In general, formal presentations by selected specialists and consultants were followed by group discussion, small group work, and individual study. Consultants and resource persons were drawn from education, industry, and government and were used extensively in the activity of each of the institutes.

The institutes served 122 participants (114 men and 8 women) from 43 states, Puerto Rico and Canada.

Project evaluation.--The project evaluation was designed primarily to determine the participant's:

. Gain in knowledge acquired from the institute.

. Plans to utilize knowledge gained to affect positive program change.

. Satisfaction with the content, presentation and operation of the institute.

The data used in evaluating the institutes were obtained from the application form and six specifically prepared instruments. Electronic data processing equipment was used in the data reduction.

A meeting to review and interpret the project evaluation was held at The Center on October 12 and 13, 1967.

Preparation of additional instructional materials.--The Project Evaluation Committee recommended that additional instructional
materials be prepared and distributed to the institute participants and staff for use in conducting future state and locally sponsored leadership development institutes in technical education. In compliance with these suggestions, the following materials were compiled:

(a) selected papers presented in the four institutes.

(b) an ERIC package presentation including transparency masters and script.

(c) a compilation of facilities layouts for vocational and technical education.

RESULTS

The results of the project evaluation and highlights of these findings are summarized in the following paragraphs:

Description of participants.--The typical institute participant was approximately 45 years of age, male, employed in a post-high school institution, had served in that capacity for approximately three years, had an average of 13 years of professional educational work experience and six years of non-educational work experience, and held the master's degree.

Participant's gain in knowledge.--The average participant in the State Staff Institutes had a gain score of 11.42 on a 25 item self appraisal instrument administered as a pre-test and post-test, and an average percentage gain of 15.22 percent.

The average participant in the General Institutes had a gain score of 46.45 on a 50 item self appraisal instrument administered as a pre-test and post-test and an average percentage gain of 33.61 percent.

Participant's present and planned activities.--The average institute participant (both General and State Staff Institutes) had an average absolute change score on a 5-point scale for each of 25 items of 1.10. Any change from present to planned program activities was assumed to be positive. The average participant's percentage of gain, by institute, from their present to planned activities score ranged from a low of 34.98 to a high of 42.23 percent.

Participant's evaluation of institute presentations.--The average participant's evaluation on six aspects of institute presentations was 23.31 (6 = poor and 30 = excellent).

Discussion

The project evaluation indicates that the institutes were successful in attracting qualified participants who represented
a geographical mix, service area mix, and a professional position classification mix.

The institutes were planned, organized and conducted in a highly creditable manner and enjoyed good attendance. Participants achieved gains in knowledge, and there was evidence that they planned to implement positive program change as a result of the institutes. The participants were generally pleased with the presentations and overall operation of the institutes. The project evaluation revealed that the consortium approach was successful in program planning, instructional materials preparation, recruitment and selection of participants, and evaluation of the institutes. The institute directors recommended that The Center develop plans to conduct similar program development institutes in 1968.

Conclusions

The conclusions which have been developed are presented in the following statements:

- The consortium approach which included program planning for the institutes, instructional materials preparation, recruitment and selection of participants, and project evaluation was successful.
- The evaluation procedures and instruments functioned successfully without distraction for each of the institutes and were effective in achieving the stated objectives of evaluation.
- All institutes were successfully conducted and well attended.
- The institutes provided for a geographical mix of participants which promoted a valuable exchange of information about technical education.
- There was a cross-sectional mix of service area, institutional classifications and professional position classifications.
- Most participants in all institutes experienced a commendable gain in knowledge. Although there were variations in gain scores from one institute to another, one cannot conclude that one institute was better than another due to the limitations of available data.
- Institute participants were generally well pleased with the presentations and over-all operation of the institutes.
- There was evidence that participants planned to implement positive program change as a result of having attended the institutes.
Implications

The implications of the findings and experience of this training project for planning and conducting similar projects in the future are outlined in the following:

- The project evaluation indicated that there is a need to determine how to identify and attract greater numbers of qualified applicants.
- Participant comments revealed that the method of evaluating institute presentations should be reviewed and refined.
- The project evaluation indicated that the scheduling of future institutes should avoid conflict with other professional activities that could limit participation of potential enrollees.

Recommendations

Based on the experience of the four institutes conducted in 1967, the following recommendations are offered regarding the nature and need for future training projects in technical education.

- National Program Development Institutes should be continued in 1968 based on the success of the 1967 institutes and the expanded need for leaders in technical education.
- The consortium approach to planning and conducting national institutes for program development should be continued.
- Leadership and program development training in technical education, supported by federal funds and national advisory services should be continued.
- The geographical location of future institutes should provide optimum transportation accessibility.
- Participants should be reimbursed for travel and subsistence.
- Attempts should be made to employ outstanding consultants for longer periods of time to provide for better coordination and to insure greater in-depth treatment of institute topics.
- The institute program should be planned and organized around fewer topics so that the most critical needs of participants can be explored in depth.
- Overhead money should be provided to the sponsoring institutions to encourage greater participation by leading centers of learning currently hampered by the present regulations.
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AGENDA

PROJECT EVALUATION CONFERENCE

NATIONAL LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT INSTITUTES
IN TECHNICAL EDUCATION

October 10-11, 1966

Monday, October 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00 a.m.</td>
<td>Pick up conference participants</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30</td>
<td>Welcome remarks</td>
<td>Robert E. Taylor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:45</td>
<td>Conference activities and expectations</td>
<td>C. J. Cotrell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00</td>
<td>Financial arrangements</td>
<td>C. J. Cotrell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:45</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>Review of instructional materials</td>
<td>I. E. Valentine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:45</td>
<td>Supplemental instructional materials</td>
<td>I. E. Valentine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:45</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:15 p.m.</td>
<td>Directors' evaluation of instructional activities by topic</td>
<td>I. E. Valentine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00</td>
<td>Topic evaluations by participants</td>
<td>D. L. Larimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:15</td>
<td>Participant selection and gain</td>
<td>I. E. Valentine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00</td>
<td>Exploration of interesting relationships</td>
<td>D. L. Larimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00</td>
<td>Return conference participants to motel</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00</td>
<td>Dinner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:30</td>
<td>Review of evaluation techniques</td>
<td>C. J. Cotrell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30</td>
<td>Review of consultants and resource persons</td>
<td>I. E. Valentine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30</td>
<td>Adjourn for evening</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Presenter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 a.m.</td>
<td>Pick up conference participants and luggage</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30</td>
<td>Implications and recommendations for future institutes</td>
<td>A. J. Miller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:15</td>
<td>Review of the structure and organization of the project and institutes</td>
<td>C. J. Cotrell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00</td>
<td>Follow-up of the 1966 participants</td>
<td>I. E. Valentine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Implications for other projects</td>
<td>C. J. Cotrell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00</td>
<td>Conference summary</td>
<td>C. J. Cotrell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30</td>
<td>Adjourn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PARTICIPANTS

Project Evaluation Meeting

October 10-11, 1966

The Center for Vocational and Technical Education
The Ohio State University

Jack Annan, Recorder-Evaluator
Department of Vocational Education
Colorado State University
Fort Collins, Colorado

H. L. Benson, Professor and Head
Department of Vocational Education
Colorado State University
Fort Collins, Colorado (Retired)

Calvin J. Cotrell
Specialist and Project Director
National Leadership Development Institutes in Technical Education
The Center for Vocational and Technical Education
The Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio

A. C. Gillie, Associate Professor
Department of Vocational-Technical Education
Rutgers - The State University
New Brunswick, New Jersey

M. Ray Karnes, Chairman
Department of Vocational-Technical Education
University of Illinois
Urbana, Illinois

R. M. Knoebel, Acting Assistant Director
State Vocational Service Branch
Division of Vocational and Technical Education
U. S. Office of Education
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Washington, D. C.

M. E. Larson, Professor
Department of Vocational Education
Colorado State University
Fort Collins, Colorado
David L. Larimore, Research Associate
The Center for Vocational and Technical Education
The Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio

Aaron J. Miller
Specialist in Technical Education
The Center for Vocational and Technical Education
The Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio

E. B. Moore, Recorder-Evaluator and Assistant Professor
College of Education
Mississippi State University
State College, Mississippi

M. W. Roney, Director
School of Industrial Education
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma

Scott Tuxhorn, Recorder-Evaluator
School of Industrial Education
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma

Ivan E. Valentine, Consultant and Project Coordinator
National Leadership Development Institutes in Technical Education
The Center for Vocational and Technical Education
The Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio
APPENDIX B

NATIONAL PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT INSTITUTES
IN TECHNICAL EDUCATION

LIST OF INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS

PRINTED MATERIALS


* Materials provided for participants as well as staff.
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20. The Youth We Haven't Served. GPO, 1966.

**AUDIO-VISUAL AIDS**


24. "Your Future Through Vocational Education." (Filmstrip.)

* Materials provided for participants as well as staff
PARTICIPANT'S SELF-APPRaisal
STATE STAFF INSTITUTE

DIRECTIONS: Please appraise what you feel is your present knowledge of the following technical education topics. Circle the number which indicates your degree of present knowledge.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative patterns at the state level.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative patterns at the local level.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current problems in the states and regions.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods for Determining Technical Program Needs</th>
<th>Very Little Knowledge</th>
<th>Little Knowledge</th>
<th>Some Knowledge</th>
<th>Much Knowledge</th>
<th>Very Highly Knowledgeable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The mechanics of surveys.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determining technician manpower needs.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilization of available needs data.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intermediate and Long-Range Planning</th>
<th>Very Little Knowledge</th>
<th>Little Knowledge</th>
<th>Some Knowledge</th>
<th>Much Knowledge</th>
<th>Very Highly Knowledgeable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Determining priorities.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilization of PERT in planning.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projecting budgetary needs.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projecting staff needs.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Staffing

11. Staff recruiting
12. In-service training for administrative staff.
13. In-service training for teaching staff.

Evaluation

14. Evaluating teaching staff.
15. Evaluating administrative staff.

Facilities and Equipment for Technical Education Programs

17. Educational specifications.
18. Equipment requirements.
20. Utilization of facilities.

Research

21. Methods of involving state staff in research.
22. Utilization of available research findings.

Technical Programs for Groups with Special Needs

23. Pre-technical program patterns.
24. Ancillary services and community resources related to training programs for disadvantaged groups.
25. Special teacher preparation needs.
**NATIONAL PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT INSTITUTES IN TECHNICAL EDUCATION**

**PARTICIPANT'S SELF-APPRAISAL GENERAL INSTITUTE**

**DIRECTIONS:** Please appraise what you feel is your present knowledge of the technical education topics listed below. Circle the number which indicates your degree of present knowledge.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rationale and Need for Technical Education</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Present and future demand for technicians.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Technician placement patterns.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. New and emerging areas of technician employment.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Size of current technical school enrollments.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Economic and social needs for technician education.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role of Technicians</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Various levels of technical training.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Fields of the &quot;work world&quot; in which technicians are employed.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The place of the technician in the occupational spectrum.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Difference between the &quot;professional&quot; and the technician.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The difference between the technician and the skilled employee.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Administrative Structure of Technical Education Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Very Little Knowledge</th>
<th>Little Knowledge</th>
<th>Some Knowledge</th>
<th>Much Knowledge</th>
<th>Very Highly Knowledgeable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>The development and operation of statewide plans for technical education.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>The relation of individual institutions to state master plans.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>The federal, state, and local relationships for technical education.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Different organizational structures of local programs of technical education.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Accreditation procedures for technical education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Description of the Technical Education Student

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Very Little Knowledge</th>
<th>Little Knowledge</th>
<th>Some Knowledge</th>
<th>Much Knowledge</th>
<th>Very Highly Knowledgeable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Program variations necessary with different student age levels.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Selection criteria for technical education students.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Sources of students for technical education.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Means of determining the number of potential students.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Desirable recruiting practices.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Program Patterns and Curriculum Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Very Little Knowledge</th>
<th>Little Knowledge</th>
<th>Some Knowledge</th>
<th>Much Knowledge</th>
<th>Very Highly Knowledgeable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Interrelationships of laboratory and shop courses with science and mathematics.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>The use of advisory committees in planning technical programs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>The cluster approach in curriculum development.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
24. Curricula for the various offerings in technical education.
25. Steps in curriculum development through occupational analysis.

Facilities and Equipment for Technical Education Programs

27. Building sites for technical education programs.
28. Equipment requirements for various technical education programs.
29. Modern media used in instructional programs.
30. Role of school staff in planning facilities and equipment.

Financing Technical Education Programs

31. Capital outlay for site, buildings, and equipment.
32. Cost per student per year.
33. Financing patterns.
34. Annual operating costs.
35. Personnel costs.

Staffing Technical Education Programs

36. Necessary qualifications of instructional staff.
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37. Necessary qualifications of supervisory personnel. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5

38. Various sources of personnel. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5

39. Teacher recruitment procedures. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5

40. Teacher selection criteria. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5

**Technical Education Supervision and Teacher Education**

41. Evaluation. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5

42. Curriculum improvement. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5

43. Certification of technical education teachers and supervisors. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5

44. Programs for developing teaching skills. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5

45. Programs for upgrading technical competence of instructors. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5

**Programs for Groups with Special Needs**

46. Special requirements for teachers. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5

47. Characteristics of socio-economically handicapped. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5

48. Ancillary services and community resources available for programs for the disadvantaged. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5

**Research**

49. Current research activities in technical education. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5

50. Administration of research activities. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5
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PARTICIPANT'S PRESENT PROGRAM ACTIVITIES

DIRECTIONS: Please indicate to what extent you are presently involved in the following activities:

1. Revising and improving present curricula.
2. Planning, developing, and initiating new technical (or related) curricula.
3. Implementing in-service teacher training or leadership activities.
4. Evaluating present programs.
5. Coordinating state or local technical education activities.
6. Implementing a public relations program.
7. Developing a master plan for vocational and/or technical education.
8. Conducting research and/or development activities.
9. Developing curriculum materials and instructional media.
10. Planning and/or developing an area vocational school, technical institute, or community college.
11. Developing leadership training programs.
12. Revising the state plan for vocational-technical education.
13. Revising the present technical teacher education program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Very Low Extent (1)</th>
<th>Low Extent (2)</th>
<th>Average Extent (3)</th>
<th>High Extent (4)</th>
<th>Very High Extent (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revising and improving present curricula.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning, developing, and initiating new technical (or related) curricula.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing in-service teacher training or leadership activities.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating present programs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinating state or local technical education activities.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing a public relations program.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing a master plan for vocational and/or technical education.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducting research and/or development activities.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing curriculum materials and instructional media.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and/or developing an area vocational school, technical institute, or community college.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing leadership training programs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revising the state plan for vocational-technical education.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revising the present technical teacher education program.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing a new technical teacher education program.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15. Conducting manpower needs surveys. 

16. Using advisory committees and groups. 

17. Using PERT techniques in planning. 

18. Advising and counseling students 

19. Recruiting additional faculty. 

20. Recruiting students. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Low Extent</th>
<th>Low Extent</th>
<th>Average Extent</th>
<th>High Extent</th>
<th>Very High Extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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#### PARTICIPANT'S PLANNED PROGRAM ACTIVITIES

**DIRECTIONS:** Please indicate to what extent you are planning to make any changes in your present program activities, as listed below, as a result of your attending this institute.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Low Extent (or not at all)</th>
<th>Low Extent</th>
<th>Average Extent</th>
<th>High Extent</th>
<th>Very High Extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Revising and improving present curricula.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Planning, developing, and initiating new technical (or related) curricula.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Implementing in-service teacher training or leadership activities.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Evaluating present programs.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Coordinating state or local technical education activities.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Implementing a public relations program.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Developing a master plan for vocational and/or technical education.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Conducting research and/or development activities.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Developing curriculum materials and instructional media.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Planning and/or developing an area vocational school, technical institute, or community college.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Developing leadership training programs.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Revising the state plan for vocational-technical education.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Revising the present technical teacher education program.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Implementing a new technical teacher education program.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Conducting manpower needs surveys.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Using advisory committees and groups.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Using PERT techniques in planning.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Advising and counseling students.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Recruiting additional faculty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Recruiting students.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NATIONAL PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT INSTITUTES
IN TECHNICAL EDUCATION

EVALUATION OF PRESENTATIONS

DIRECTIONS: Indicate on the five point scale below your opinion of the following aspects of the institute. Circling 1 indicates a rating of "poor," and circling 5 indicates a rating of "excellent."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Quality of presentations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Content of presentations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. New concepts gained</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Quality of instructional materials</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Discussion opportunities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Variety of topics covered</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
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PARTICIPANT'S PROFESSIONAL OBJECTIVES

My present position is that of (check one):

_______ Teacher
_______ Department Head or Chairman
_______ Teacher Educator
_______ Researcher
_______ Local Director
_______ Local Supervisor
_______ State Supervisory Position
_______ Administrator in Post-High School Position
_______ Other (Please indicate)

DIRECTIONS: Please indicate your immediate and long-range professional objectives below by circling the responses only where they are applicable.

Professional Objectives:

1. To continue to do my best in my present position. 1 2
2. To become an outstanding teacher. 1 2
3. To work on an advanced degree. 1 2
4. To finish my present assignment and move to a more challenging position. 1 2
5. To improve technical education programs in my present position. 1 2
6. To plan and develop new technical education programs. 1 2
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Immediate Objectives</th>
<th>Long-Range Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Within next 2 years)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. To move to a larger and more responsible position</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. To become a department head or chairman.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. To develop technical education cooperative programs with industry.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. To become a local supervisor.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. To become an administrator in a technical division of a technical institute or community college.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. To become a state supervisor.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. To become a teacher educator at a college or university.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. To work in a research position.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. To develop in-service training programs for state or local staff.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. To move into a top-level state administrative position.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. To develop new or improved technical education facilities.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. To work actively toward legislative change in my state that will allow better technical education.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. To become the top administrator in a technical institute or a collegiate institution.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. To help develop and advance technical education in foreign countries.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Other (please describe):</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other (please describe):

__________________________________________

__________________________________________

__________________________________________
APPENDIX D

NATIONAL PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT INSTITUTES
IN TECHNICAL EDUCATION

RECORDER-EVALUATOR INSTRUCTIONS

Duties of the Recorder

1. Keep a record of participant attendance.

2. Collect two copies of any teaching aids (papers, charts, booklets etc.) distributed to participants. One copy of the collected materials should be sent to The Center, and one copy should be retained as institute copy.

3. Keep a record of items that come up in discussion which should be treated at some time during the institute. Discuss these items with the institute director.

4. Arrange to have pictures made of participants and staff at the institute.

5. It is the responsibility of the recorder-evaluator to submit a summary of each presentation as prepared or approved by the presenter. In addition, the recorder-evaluator should include a copy of the complete presentation when one is available. The following information should be included in the summary:
   a. Title of presentation.
   b. Presenter's full name, title, and address.
   c. Date of presentation.

   If any important work or document is cited in the original paper, it is necessary to indicate in the summary of the presentation, the complete title of document, source, and author.

6. Prepare the final report for the institute according to the established format and send it to The Center in duplicate by September 1, 1967.

Duties of the Evaluator

1. Distribute and collect all evaluation instruments.

2. Give the participants instructions on how to complete each evaluation instrument.

3. Tabulate results of the participants' evaluations of presentations (Form 03-White copy) for use by institute director.
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Schedule and Procedures for the Evaluator

1. Obtain a roster of participants and assign a code number for each participant. Prepare a 3 x 5 card with the participant's name on one side and his personal code number on the reverse side. The following code numbers are assigned to the various institutes:

   - California: 600
   - Connecticut: 700
   - Mississippi: 800
   - Utah: 900

   A roster of participants with the proper code numbers must accompany the materials sent to The Center.

2. Introduction. During the first morning of the institute, the institute director should introduce the idea of evaluation, comment on the need for it, and clarify its purpose.

3. Give each participant the card with his name and personal code number. Request that he keep the card and record his number on each evaluation form completed during the institute.

4. Pre-Test (Participant's Self-Appraisal). Form Q1-S for the State Institutes and Form Q1-G for the General Institutes should be administered and collected Monday morning of the first week. This procedure should be followed:

   a. Distribute instruments and IBM answer cards.

   b. Request each participant to write his code number in the space for "student number" on the front of the IBM answer card. The number "1" should be written in the space for "sequence number."

   c. Read the directions to participants and clarify any questions. Participants will not write on the Self-Appraisal form. Their answers should be placed on the IBM answer cards.

   d. Administer test.

   e. Collect the completed cards and test forms. Check that each card has a participant code number and that there are no omissions or duplications of numbers recorded in the code range assigned.
5. **Participant's Present Program Activities.** Form 02 should also be administered and collected **Monday morning of the first week.** This procedure should be followed:
   
   a. Distribute the instruments and IBM answer cards.
   
   b. Request each participant to write his code number in the space for "student number" on the front of the IBM answer card. The number "1" should also be written in the space for "sequence number."
   
   c. Read the directions to participants and clarify any questions. Participants will not write on the Present Program Activities form. Answers should be placed on IBM answer cards.
   
   d. Administer Form 02.
   
   e. Collect the completed cards and test forms. Check each card for code number and for omissions and duplications.

6. **Evaluation of Presentations.** Administer and collect presentation evaluations (Form 03) on **Friday of the first week** and **Thursday of the second week.** Use this procedure:
   
   a. Distribute instruments to participants and institute staff. (White copy for participants, yellow copy for staff.)
   
   b. Request that participants put their code numbers in the upper right hand corner of the page and indicate first or second week in the upper left hand corner.
   
   c. Read the directions to participants, suggest that participants make comments in the space provided and clarify any questions about the form.
   
   d. Administer Form 03.
   
   e. Collect completed instruments. Check to see that each has a code number and that the week is identified.

7. **Participant's Planned Program Activities.** Administer and collect **Participant's Planned Program Activities (Form 04) on Thursday of the last week.** This is the procedure to follow:
   
   a. Distribute the instruments and IBM cards.
   
   b. Ask participants to write code number in the space for "student number" on the front of the IBM answer card. The number "2" should be written in the space for "sequence number."
c. Read the directions to the participants and clarify any questions. Participants will not write on the form. The answers should be placed on the IBM answer cards.

d. Administer Form 04.

e. Collect the completed cards and test forms. Check for code numbers, omissions, and duplications.

8. **Participant's Professional Objectives.** Administer and collect this form (05) on Thursday of the last week. The procedure to be followed is:

   a. Distribute the instruments.

   b. Ask the participants to put their code number in the upper right hand corner. Also ask them to indicate their present position title in the space provided.

   c. Read the directions to the participants and clarify any questions.

   d. Administer Form 05.

   e. Collect completed instruments and check for code numbers.

9. **Post-Test (Participant's Self-Appraisal).** Form 01-S for State Institutes and 01-G for General Institutes should be administered and collected on Thursday of the last week. Use the following procedure:

   a. Distribute instruments and IBM answer cards.

   b. Request each participant to write his code number in the space for "student number" on the front of the IBM answer card. The number "2" should be written in the space for "sequence number."

   c. Read the directions to participants and clarify any questions. Participants should not write on the Self-Appraisal form. Their answers should be placed on the IBM answer cards.

   d. Administer test.

   e. Collect the completed cards and test forms. Check that each card has a participant code number and that there are no omissions or duplications of numbers recorded in the code range assigned.

10. All evaluation instruments and cards should be sent to The Center at the close of the institutes. The IBM cards should be assembled in individual packets according to the instrument to which they apply. The individual packets should then be labeled as "Pre-Test," "Post-Test," "Participant's Present Program Activities," and "Participant's Planned Program Activities." The evaluation instruments should be packaged sequentially (participant number) by each instrument.
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Topical Outline - General Leadership Development Institute

I. The Leadership Role and Charge
   A. The campus
   B. The Institute program
   C. The role and responsibility of leaders
   D. The initial evaluation (pre-test)

II. The Rationale and Need for Technical Education
   A. Studies and surveys
      1. Labor market trends
         a. Local
         b. State
         c. National
         d. International
      2. Population growth trends
         a. General
         b. School
         c. Mobility
         d. Immigration
      3. Changes in occupations
      4. Changes in sources of technicians
      5. Changes in school attendance
      6. Assessment of present and future needs
      7. The rate of change in technology
      8. Technician placement studies
      9. Social, economic, and psychological need of the individual for training and employment.
      10. The employers need for technicians
      11. The shift in educational emphasis from doing to thinking to feeling
III. Description of the Technical Education Student

A. Economic need of individuals
B. Persons who can profit from technical education
C. Programs to meet needs of various age groups
D. Criteria for selecting students
E. Sources of students

IV. Administrative Structure of Technical Education Institutions

A. State-wide patterns
B. Public Schools
   1. Community colleges
   2. Technical institutes
   3. Area schools
   4. Four-year colleges
C. Private schools
D. Military services
E. Other governmental agencies
F. Correspondence schools

V. Program Patterns and Curriculum Development

A. Flexibility
B. Diversity
C. Broad cluster training approach to curricula
D. Comprehensiveness
E. Continuous re-examination of purpose
F. Continuing change of program with new knowledge
G. Community oriented program
H. Exploiting community resources
I. Student appeal
J. Response to the needs of people
K. Anticipation of future needs
   1. New products
   2. New processes
L. Continuing education

VI. Facilities and Equipment for Technical Education Programs
   A. The site
      1. Using advisory committees
      2. Selection
      3. Location
   B. Building
      1. Type of construction
      2. Design
   C. Equipment
      1. Comparable to industry
   D. Provision for modern teaching
   E. Illumination
   F. Development of laboratories
      1. Time required
      2. Planning
   G. Conference facilities
   H. Library
   I. Cafeteria
   J. Supplies
   K. Anticipatory planning

VII. Staffing Technical Education Programs
   A. Types of personnel
1. Technical teachers
2. Mathematics and science teachers
3. General education teachers
4. Auxiliary course teachers
5. Librarians
6. Supervisors
7. Administrators

B. Qualifications for each type of staff member

C. Functions of administrators and supervisors

D. Sources of supply for staff
1. Recruitment
2. Selection

VIII. Financing Technical Education Programs

A. Capital outlay
1. Plant
2. Equipment
3. Sites
   a. Free sites
   b. Selected sites

B. Operating costs
1. Personnel services
2. Overhead

C. Comparative costs
1. Cost per student per year
2. Justification for costs
3. Room utilization

D. Financing patterns
IX. Supervision and In-Service Teacher Education
   A. Personnel services
   B. Effective use of facilities
   C. Curriculum improvement
   D. Effective techniques of evaluation
   E. Accreditation

X. Establishing Research and Development Needs
   A. The role of research and development
   B. Utilization of research in administration of technical education
   C. Identification of critical research and development problems
Topical Outline - State Staff Development Institute

I. Leadership - The Role and Responsibility
   A. The campus and its facilities
   B. The Institute program
      1. Philosophy of technical education
      2. Rationale and need
      3. Program content
   C. The State leadership role
   D. Institute evaluation plans

II. Current Practices and Trends in Technical Education
   A. Current problems in the various states and regions
   B. Current administrative patterns for technical programs
      1. State patterns
      2. Local patterns

III. Technician Need Surveys
   A. Determining existing occupational needs
   B. Projecting for future needs
   C. Determining existing and potential student populations
   D. Utilization of available data
      1. Bureau of labor statistics data
      2. Industry data
   E. Determination of sources of technicians in training
   F. The mechanics of surveys
      1. Sources of survey expertise

IV. State and Local Resources for Program Support
   A. Use of industrial and professional advisory committees
1. State advisory groups
2. Local advisory groups
3. Composition of resource groups
4. Responsibilities of resource groups

B. Professional organizations
C. Civic organizations
D. Legislative and political support

V. Coordinating Technician Training with other Vocational Areas
A. Engineering technology
B. Health related technologies
C. Para-medical technologies
D. Biological science technologies
E. Agricultural related technologies
F. Business and office related technologies
G. Technical occupations relating to home economics skills

VI. Publicizing Technical Programs
A. Industry support and resources
B. Resources of state institutions
C. Local institutional resources
D. Maximum use of available communications media

VII. Intermediate and Long Range Program Planning
A. Determination of priorities
B. Determination of needed facilities
C. Projected financial needs
D. Projected staff needs
E. Interstate planning and cooperative programs
VIII. Staffing for Supervisory Positions

A. Identification of staff
B. Staff recruiting
C. Qualifications and certification
D. In-service training for staff
   1. Teaching
   2. Administrative

IX. Evaluating Technical Education Programs, Staff and Facilities

A. Implications of Federal acts concerning evaluation
B. Curriculum
   1. Standards and criteria
   2. Present technologies
   3. Implications for emerging technologies
C. Sources of input for evaluation criteria
   1. Advisory committees
   2. Accrediting agencies
   3. Graduate feedback
   4. Self-study
D. Facilities
   1. Equipment
   2. Library
   3. Student facilities
   4. Utilization of facilities
E. Counseling and Placement
   1. Guidance
   2. Recruitment
   3. Drop-out ratios
4. Placement methods
5. Graduate follow-up

F. Staff Evaluation Instruments
   1. Teachers
   2. Administrators
   3. Professional responsibilities

X. Reporting Systems and Data Handling
   A. Methods of reporting data
   B. Types of data
   C. Sources of data

XI. Research Responsibility
   A. Research involvement as a function of the state staff
   B. Research involvement at the local level
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Sunday, July 16
3:00 - 6:00 p.m. Registration - Reception Social Hour

Host:

Monday, July 17
9:00 - 10:00 a.m.  Greetings

Conference Plan of Operation

10:00 - 10:20 a.m. Coffee Break

10:20 - 12:00 noon Institute Evaluation

Interchange of Practices

12:00 - 1:30 p.m. Lunch

1:30 - 3:00 p.m. Symposium - Current Practices and Trends in Technical Education

3:00 - 3:20 p.m. Coffee Break

3:20 - 5:00 p.m. Data Reading

Tuesday, July 18
9:00 - 10:00 a.m. Anatomy of a Group

10:00 - 10:20 a.m. Coffee Break

10:20 - 12:00 noon Technician Need Surveys

12:00 - 1:30 p.m. Lunch

1:30 - 2:30 p.m. Leadership - The Role and Responsibility
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2:30 - 3:00 p.m.  Introduction to Simulation  David Allen
3:00 - 3:20 p.m.  Coffee Break
3:20 - 5:00 p.m.  First Simulation Activity  Staff

Wednesday, July 19
9:00 -10:00 a.m.  Presentation before the Board  Francis Laird
10:00 -10:20 a.m.  Coffee Break
10:20 -12:00 noon  State and Local Resources for Program Support  Archie Breslan
12:00 - 1:30 p.m.  Lunch
1:30 - 3:00 p.m.  Coordinating Technical Training with other Vocational Areas  William G. Loomis
3:00 - 3:20 p.m.  Coffee Break
3:20 - 3:45 p.m.  Simulation Howgozit  David Allen
3:45 - 5:00 p.m.  Second Simulation Activity, Staff Part A
6:00 p.m.  Barbecue

Thursday, July 20
9:00 -10:00 a.m.  Evaluating Technical Education Programs  Wallace T. Homitz
10:00 - 3:00 p.m.  Field Tr. to Industry  Air Research Rocketdyne
3:00 - 3:20 p.m.  Coffee Break
3:20 - 4:00 p.m.  Discussion - Impressions of Visit  David Jackey
4:00 5:00 p.m.  Second Simulation Activity, Staff Part B

Friday, July 21
9:00 -10:00 a.m.  Professional Organizations  C. Thomas Dean

Rooms for Simulation Activities will be assigned.
10:00 - 10:20 a.m. Coffee Break

10:20 - 12:00 noon Staffing for Supervisory Positions and Staff Evaluation Instruments

Al Jochen

12:00 - 1:30 p.m. Lunch

1:30 - 3:00 p.m. Reporting Systems and Data Handling

C. A. Wacker

3:00 - 3:20 p.m. Coffee Break

3:20 - 5:00 p.m. Management Engineering - PERT and FIRM (Pt. 1)

Pete Tulenko

Monday, July 24

9:00 - 10:00 a.m. Implications of Federal Act Concerning Evaluation

Melvin L. Barlow

10:00 - 10:20 a.m. Coffee Break

10:20 - 12:00 noon Evaluation of Students, Counseling, and Placement Services

John Buller

12:00 - 1:30 p.m. Buffet Lunch

1:30 - 3:00 p.m. Evaluation Criteria

Irvin Colt

3:00 - 3:20 p.m. Coffee Break

3:20 - 5:00 p.m. Management Engineering - PERT and FIRM (Pt. 2)

Pete Tulenko

Tuesday, July 25

9:00 - 10:00 a.m. Sample Public Relations Films

Ted Elmgren

10:00 - 10:20 a.m. Coffee Break

10:20 - 12:00 noon Public Relations

F. Parker Wilber

12:00 - 1:30 p.m. Lunch

1:30 - 3:00 p.m. Facilities

Michael Russo (Fireside Lounge)

3:00 - 3:20 p.m. Coffee Break
3:20 - 3:45 p.m. Simulation Howgozit
3:45 - 5:00 Third Simulation Activity, Staff
            Part A
Wednesday, July 26

9:00 - 10:00 a.m. Newspaper Interviews
10:00 - 10:20 Coffee Break
10:20 - 3:00 p.m. Visit Junior Colleges
            Los Angeles Trade-
            Technical College
            El Camino College

3:00 - 3:20 Coffee Break
3:20 - 4:00 Discussion - Impression
          of Visit
4:00 - 5:00 Third Simulation Activity, Staff
            Part B
6:00 Steak Dinner

Thursday, July 27

9:00 - 10:00 a.m. Research
10:00 - 10:20 Coffee Break
10:20 - 11:10 Long Range Planning
11:10 - 12:00 noon Philosophical Point of
          View
12:00 - 1:30 p.m. Lunch
1:30 - 2:30 New Leadership Role
            of the Office of Education
            (Royce Hall Auditorium)
2:45 - 3:00 Simulation Howgozit
3:00 - 3:20 Coffee Break
3:20 - 5:00 Fourth Simulation Activity Staff

Friday, July 28

9:00 - 9:45 a.m. Report to the Board
            Regarding Future Plans
9:45 - 10:00 Simulation Howgozit
10:00 - 10:20 Coffee Break
10:20 - 11:30 Cameron School District
            Reports Back
            Cameron School
            District Personnel
11:30 - 12:00 noon Last Evaluation and
            Falling-Out Ceremonies
            Richard Nelson
            David Jackey
THE UNIVERSITY OF CONNNECTICUT
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Monday, July 24

8:00 a.m. General Orientation Staff
9:00 Current Practices and Trends Richard W. Howes
in Technical Education
10:00 Group Picture
11:00 Role and Responsibility of John W. Struck
Leadership
12:00 noon Lunch
1:30 p.m. Role and Responsibility of John W. Struck
Leadership (continued)
Richard W. Howes
Group Discussions

Tuesday, July 25

8:30 a.m. Program Planning Evaluation W. Howard Martin
and Program Planning in Technical Education
9:15 Program Planning - Technical
Robert M. Knoebel
Education
Group Discussions
12:00 noon Lunch
1:30 p.m. Program Planning - The American Lewis J. Fibel
Association of Junior Colleges
2:30 Simulation in Training of Raymond Stinchfield
Administrators

Wednesday, July 26

9:00 a.m. Program Planning - Research in Herbert Righthand
Technical Education
Group Discussions
12:00 noon Lunch
1:30 p.m. Program Planning - Technician Herbert Righthand
Need Survey

F-5
Thursday, July 27

2:30 p.m.  Videotape in Education  
            Thomas Goodkind

9:00 a.m.  Program Planning—Technical  
            Teacher Education (continued)  
            Jerry Dobrovolny

            Group Discussions

12:00 noon  Lunch

1:30 p.m.  Field Trip—Thames Valley  
            Donald Welter

            State Technical College
            Norwich, Connecticut

Friday, July 28

9:00 a.m.  Program Planning—Staffing for  
            Vocational and Technical Education  
            John Beaumont

10:30  Group Discussions

12:00 noon  Lunch

1:30 p.m.  Evaluation  
            Staff

2:30  Program Planning and New
            Instructional Media

            Group Discussions

Monday, July 31

9:00 a.m.  Resources for Program Support  
            (Federal Programs)  
            John Edwards

            Group Discussions

12:00 noon  Lunch

1:30 p.m.  Resources for Program Support  
            (Advisory Committees)  
            Joseph Murphy

            Group Discussions

Tuesday, August 1

9:00 a.m.  Evaluating Technical Education  
            Lucian Lombardi

            Group Discussions

12:00 noon  Lunch
1:30 p.m. Evaluating Technical Education (continued) Lucian Lombardi

Wednesday, August 2

8:30 a.m. Information Retrieval and its Implications for Technical Education Ivan Valentine

9:00 Promoting and Publicizing Technical Education William Streib

11:00 Field Trip - Springfield Technical Institute Edmund Garvey Teresina Thompson

Thursday, August 3

9:00 a.m. Evaluation of Vocational Education Joseph Nerden

11:30 Evaluation Staff

12:15 p.m. Lunch

2:30 Field Trip - United Aircraft Research Laboratories, East Hartford, Connecticut

5:30 Dinner - Tobacco Valley Inn, Windsor

Friday, August 4

8:00 a.m. Group and Individual Reports of Plans Participants

10:30 Evaluation of Institute Staff

12:00 noon Lunch

1:30 p.m. Preparation of Final Report Individual Conferences as Scheduled
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MISSISSIPPI STATE UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE PROGRAM

Monday, July 10

8:45 a.m. Welcome John K. Bettersworth
Orientation E. B. Moore, Jr.
9:30 Coffee Break

10:00 Presentation - Technical Education Ray Karnes

11:00 The Institute Recorder and Plan of Procedure James C. Hilyer, Jr.

12:00 noon Lunch

1:00 p.m. Presentation - Leadership in Education Willis A. LaVire

2:30 Coffee Break

3:00 Group Discussions

4:00 Group Reports

4:30 Adjourn

Tuesday, July 11

8:30 a.m. Presentation - Rationale and Need for Technical Education Edwin L. Kurth

10:00 Coffee Break

10:30 Discussion Edwin L. Kurth

12:00 noon Lunch

1:00 p.m. Group Discussions

2:30 Coffee Break

3:00 Group Reports

4:30 Adjourn

7:30 Interest Group Discussions
Wednesday, July 12

8:30 a.m.  Presentation - The Technical Student  Donald S. Phillips
10:00    Coffee Break
10:30    Discussion  Donald S. Phillips
12:00 noon  Lunch
1:00 p.m.  Presentation - A Method of Training Teachers of Technical Subjects  Harold J. Morris
2:30    Coffee Break
3:00    Presentation - Research as a Leadership Tool  James E. Wall
4:30    Adjourn
7:30    Interest Group Discussions

Thursday, July 13

8:30 a.m.  Presentation - Program Patterns and Curriculum Development  Walter J. Brooking
10:00    Coffee Break
10:30    Discussion  Walter J. Brooking
12:00 noon  Lunch
1:00 p.m.  Group Discussions
2:30    Coffee Break
3:00    Presentation - The Role of a Curriculum Laboratory in Support of Vocational and Technical Education  Robert Sartin
4:00    Presentation - User View of Electronics Curriculum  R. J. Vasek
5:00    Adjourn
7:30    Interest Group Discussions

Friday, July 14

8:30 a.m.  Presentation - New Programs in Occupational Education  K. G. Skaggs
10:00 a.m.  Coffee Break
10:30  Discussion  K. G. Skaggs
12:00 noon  Lunch
1:00 p.m.  Presentation - Programs for the Culturally and Educationally Deprived  Johnnie R. Clarke  Walter Washington
2:30  Coffee Break
3:00  Discussion  Johnnie R. Clarke  Granville P. Diffie  Walter Washington
4:30  Adjourn

Monday, July 17
8:30 a.m.  Presentation - Design Solution for Technical Education Facilities  George Mehallis
10:00  Coffee Break
10:30  Discussion  George Mehallis
12:00 noon  Lunch
1:00 p.m.  Group Discussions
2:30  Coffee Break
3:00  Group Reports
4:30  Adjourn
7:30  Interest Group Discussions

Tuesday, July 18
6:30 a.m.  Presentation - Staffing Programs of Technical Education  Joseph T. Nerden
10:00  Coffee Break
10:30  Discussion  Joseph T. Nerden
12:00 noon  Lunch
1:00 p.m. Group Discussion
2:30 Coffee Break
3:00 Presentation - Community Power Structure and Educational Programs
E. B. Moore, Jr.
4:30 Adjourn
7:30 Interest Group Discussions

Wednesday, July 19
8:30 a.m. Presentation - Financing Technical Education
Joseph T. Nerden
10:00 Coffee Break
10:30 Discussion
Joseph T. Nerden
12:00 noon Lunch
1:00 p.m. Group Discussion
2:30 Coffee Break
3:00 Presentation - Project Evaluation and Review Technique
Max Hailey
4:30 Adjourn

Thursday, July 20
8:30 a.m. Presentation - Supervision and In-Service Teacher Education
Edwin L. Kurth
10:00 Coffee Break
10:30 Presentation - New Programs in Technical Teacher Education
Edwin L. Kurth
12:00 noon Lunch
1:00 p.m. Presentation - Administrative Structure for Technical Education
Gerald B. James
2:30 Coffee Break
3:00 Discussion
Gerald B. James
4:30 Adjourn
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**Friday, July 21**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00 a.m.</td>
<td>Presentation - Overview of Presentation on Research in Technical Education</td>
<td>J. Paschal Twyman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30</td>
<td>Presentation - The Center for Research and Leadership Development in Vocational and Technical Education and Educational Resource Information Center</td>
<td>Kenney E. Gray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00</td>
<td>Closing Exercise - Address by Presentation of Certificates</td>
<td>M. M. Hawkins, John K. Bettersworth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Monday, July 17

8:00 a.m. Introductions - Orientation, Registration

9:00 Pre-Testing

9:45 Refreshment Break

10:15 Welcoming Remarks

10:30 Presentation - Leadership Role and Change

12:00 noon Lunch

1:00 p.m. Group Discussion - Leadership Role and Change

2:00 Film - Future in Your Hands - Utah Technical College at Salt Lake City

2:30 Refreshment Break

3:00 Presentation - Rationale and Need for Technical Education

Tuesday, July 18

8:30 a.m. Presentation - Rationale and Need for Technical Education

10:00 Refreshment Break

10:30 Group Picture

10:45 Group Discussion - Rationale and Need for Technical Education

12:00 noon Lunch

1:00 p.m. Presentation - Administrative Structure of Technical Education Institutions

2:30 Refreshment Break

3:00 Group Discussion - Administrative Structure of Technical Education Institutions

7:00 Steak Fry
Wednesday, July 19

8:30 a.m.  Presentation - The Technical Education Student  John F. VanDerslice

10:00  Refreshment Break

10:30  Group Discussion - The Technical Education Student  John F. VanDerslice

12:00 noon  Lunch

1:00 p.m.  Presentation - Staffing Technical Education Programs  Howard B. Gundersen

2:30  Refreshment Break

3:00  Group Discussion - Staffing Technical Education Programs  Howard B. Gundersen

4:00  Film - Technicians for Tomorrow - Connecticut Staff Bureau of Technical Institutes  Howard B. Gundersen

7:00  The Clinic

Thursday, July 20

8:30 a.m.  Presentation - Staffing Technical Education Programs  Howard B. Gundersen

10:00  Refreshment Break

10:30  Panel Discussion - Staffing Technical Education Programs

12:00 noon  Lunch

1:00 p.m.  Presentation - Establishing Research and Development Needs  Austin G. Loveless

2:30  Refreshment Break

3:00  Group Discussion - Research and Development Needs  Austin G. Loveless

4:30  Tour - Utah State University Engineering Facilities

Friday, July 21

6:30 a.m.  Field Trip - Kennecott Copper Corporation, Litton Industries Utah Technical College at Salt Lake City
Saturday, July 22

8:30 a.m.  Presentation - Curriculum Development  Kenneth C. Farrer
10:00    Refreshment Break
10:30    Discussion - Curriculum Development  Kenneth C. Farrer

Monday, July 24

8:30 a.m.  Presentation - Program Patterns and Curriculum Development  Lynn A. Emerson
10:00    Refreshment Break
10:30    Presentation - Program Patterns and Curriculum Development  Lynn A. Emerson
12:00    Lunch
1:00 p.m.  Presentation - Accreditation of Technical Education Schools and Curriculums  William E. Mortimer
2:30    Refreshment Break
3:00    Presentation - Program Patterns and Curriculum Development  Lynn A. Emerson

Tuesday, July 25

8:30 a.m.  Presentation - Program Patterns and Curriculum Development  Lynn A. Emerson
10:00    Refreshment Break
10:15    Presentation - The Center for Vocational and Technical Education and ERIC  Aaron J. Miller
10:30    Discussion - Curriculum Development  Lynn A. Emerson
12:00 noon    Lunch
1:00 p.m.  Presentation - Supervision and In-Service Teacher Education  Howard A. Matthews
2:30    Refreshment Break
3:00    Discussion - Teacher Education  Howard A. Matthews
4:30    Presentation - Educational Planning - PERT  Austin G. Loveless
Wednesday, July 26

8:30 a.m. Presentation - Supervision and In-Service Teacher Education

Howard A. Matthews

10:00 Refreshment Break

10:30 Discussion - Teacher Education

Howard A. Matthews

12:00 noon Lunch

1:00 p.m. Presentation - Financing Technical Education

Joseph T. Nerden

2:30 Refreshment Break

3:00 Discussion - Financing Technical Education

Joseph T. Nerden

7:00 Presentation - The Role of the Consultant and - The Pittsburg Plan

A. Maurice Capson

Thursday, July 27

8:30 a.m. Presentation - Financing Technical Education

Joseph T. Nerden

10:00 Refreshment Break

10:30 Discussion - Financing Technical Education

Joseph T. Nerden

12:00 noon Lunch

1:00 p.m. Post Testing

Dennis A. Dirksen

1:45 Presentation - Implementation of State Technical Services Act

Harlan L. Scherer

2:30 Refreshment Break

3:00 Presentation - Facilities and Equipment for Technical Education

Milton E. Larson

7:00 Discussion - Facilities and Equipment

Milton E. Larson

Friday, July 28

8:30 a.m. Presentation - Facilities and Equipment for Technical Education

Milton E. Larson

10:00 Refreshment Break

10:30 Travel Form

10:45 Closing Exercises - Presentation of Certificates

Dean F. Peterson
APPENDIX G

THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT LOS ANGELES

INSTITUTE STAFF

Institute Co-Directors

Melvin L. Barlow, Director
Division of Vocational Education
University of California
Los Angeles, California

Richard S. Nelson, Chief
Bureau of Industrial Education
State Department of Education
Sacramento, California

David Allen, Supervisor
Trade and Technical Teacher Education
University of California at Los Angeles
Los Angeles, California

Joseph C. Bellenger, Assistant Superintendent
Adult and Vocational Education
San Jose Unified School District
San Jose, California

Robert J. Boyden, Director
Olympia Vocational Technical School
317 East Fourth Avenue
Olympia, Washington

Archie Breslin
State Supervisor of Distributive Education
P. O. Box 248
Olympia, Washington

John Buller, Associate Dean
Admissions and Records
Golden West College
15744 Golden West Street
Huntington Beach, California

Irvin Colt, Dean and
Coordinator of Vocational and Technical Education
Mt. San Antonio College
1100 North Grand Avenue
Walnut, California

C. Thomas Dean, Division Chairman
Applied Arts and Sciences
California State College of Long Beach
6101 East 7th Street
Long Beach, California

George Ebey, Vice President
Management and Economic Research, Inc.
800 Welch Road
Palo Alto, California
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Francis Laird, Coordinator
Industry-Education Relations
Autonetics Division of North American Aviation, Inc.
3370 East Mira Loma
Anaheim, California

Richard L. Lano, Assistant Supervisor
Trade and Technical Teacher Education
University of California at Los Angeles
Los Angeles, California

William G. Loomis, State Director
Vocational Education
Salem, Oregon

John M. Meyer, Assistant Supervisor
Trade and Technical Teacher Education
University of California at Los Angeles
Los Angeles, California

Sidney McGaw, Dean of Vocational Education
San Jose City College
2100 Moorpark Avenue
San Jose, California

Aaron J. Miller, Coordinator, Development and Training
The Center for Vocational and Technical Education
The Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio

John Owens, Coordinator
Trade and Technical Education
Orange Coast College
2701 Fairview Road
Costa Mesa, California

Lee Ralston, Director
Division of Practical Arts Education
Los Angeles County Schools
155 West Washington Boulevard
Los Angeles, California

Phillip E. Ricker, Assistant Supervisor
Trade and Technical Teacher Education
University of California at Los Angeles
Los Angeles, California

Mack Stoker, Regional Coordinator
State Bureau of Industrial Education
217 West First Street
Los Angeles, California

Graham Sullivan, Deputy Commissioner
U. S. Office of Education
Washington, D. C.
Pete Tulenko, Advance Computing Research Specialist  
Rocketdyne-Canoga Annex  
6633 Canoga Avenue  
Canoga Park, California

Dick Turpin, Educational Writer  
Los Angeles Times  
Times Mirror Square  
Los Angeles, California

C. A. Wacker  
Hughes Aircraft, Aerospace Group  
P. O. Box 90515  
Bldg. 130, Mail Station 20  
Los Angeles, California

Catherine Welsh, Program Officer  
Vocational and Technical Education  
U. S. Office of Education, Region IX  
San Francisco, California

Francis H. Wetmore, Special Officer  
Lakeshore Regional School Board  
450 Church Street  
Beaconsfield, Quebec, Canada

F. Parker Wilber, President  
Los Angeles Trade Technical College  
400 West Washington Boulevard  
Los Angeles, California

Don Wilson, Chief  
Bureau of Agriculture Education  
State Department of Education  
721 Capitol Mall, Room 413  
Sacramento, California
INSTITUTE STAFF

Institute Director

W. Howard Martin
Associate Professor of Education
University of Connecticut
Storrs, Connecticut

Institute Associate Director

Lucian Lombardi
Director
State Technical Colleges
Connecticut State Department of Education
Hartford, Connecticut

John A. Beaumont, Director
Vocational and Technical Education Division
Board of Vocational Education and Rehabilitation
Springfield, Illinois

Clarence Calder, Assistant Professor of Education
University of Connecticut
Storrs, Connecticut

Jerry Dobrovolny, Professor and Head
Department of Engineering
University of Illinois
Urbana, Illinois

John Edwards, Program Specialist
Department of Health, Education and Welfare
Regional Office No. 1
J. F. K. Federal Building
Boston, Massachusetts

Lewis J. Fibel, Occupational Specialist
American Association of Junior Colleges
Washington, D. C.

Edmund Garvey, Director
Springfield Technical Institute
Springfield, Massachusetts

Thomas Goodkind, Assistant Professor of Education
University of Connecticut
Storrs, Connecticut

Richard W. Howes, Assistant Director for Vocational Education
Connecticut State Department of Education
Hartford, Connecticut

Robert Knoebel, Assistant Director
Bureau of Community Colleges
Pennsylvania Department of Public Instruction
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania
Richard Lalley, Graduate Assistant
University of Connecticut
Storrs, Connecticut

Joseph F. Murphy, State Director
Vocational Education
Connecticut State Department of Education
Hartford, Connecticut

Joseph T. Nerden, Professor of Education
North Carolina State University
Raleigh, North Carolina

Herbert Righthand, Chief
Bureau of Vocational Services
Connecticut State Department of Education
Hartford, Connecticut

Raymond Stinchfield, Associate Professor of Education
University of Connecticut
Storrs, Connecticut

William Streib, Associate Professor
Delta College
University Center, Michigan

John Struck, State Director
Vocational Education
Pennsylvania State Department of Education
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania

Teresina Thompson, Assistant Director
Springfield Technical Institute
Springfield, Massachusetts

Ivan E. Valentine, Consultant
The Center for Vocational and Technical Education
The Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E. F. Mitchell</td>
<td>Professor and Head</td>
<td>Department of Industrial Education</td>
<td>Mississippi State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>College of Education</td>
<td>State College, Mississippi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. B. Moore, Jr.</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Department of Elementary and Secondary Education</td>
<td>Mississippi State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>College of Education</td>
<td>State College, Mississippi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter J. Brooking</td>
<td>Program Specialist</td>
<td>Technical Education</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnnie R. Clarke</td>
<td>Assistant Dean</td>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
<td>St. Petersburg Junior College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>St. Petersburg, Florida</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas Colston</td>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>Programs of Technical Education</td>
<td>Hinds Junior College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Raymond, Mississippi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granville Diffie</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Guided Studies</td>
<td>The Florida Junior College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jacksonville, Florida</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Hailey</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Department of Industrial Engineering</td>
<td>Mississippi State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>College of Engineering</td>
<td>State College, Mississippi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James C. Hilyer, Jr.</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Department of Elementary and Secondary Education</td>
<td>Mississippi State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>College of Education</td>
<td>State College, Mississippi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerald E. James</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Rockingham Community College</td>
<td>Wentworth, North Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Ray Karnes</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Department of Vocational and Technical Education</td>
<td>University of Illinois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>College of Education</td>
<td>Urbana, Illinois</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Edwin L. Kurth, Associate Professor
College of Education
University of Florida
Gainesville, Florida

Willis A. LaVire, Associate Professor of Education and Associate Director of Junior College Leadership Program
University of Florida
Gainesville, Florida

George Mehallis, Director
Technical, Vocational and Semiprofessional Studies
Miami-Dade Junior College
Miami, Florida

H. J. Morris, Head
Department of Community College Education and Associate Director of Ford Foundation Project
Mississippi State University
State College, Mississippi

Joseph T. Nerden, Professor
Department of Industrial and Technical Education
School of Education
North Carolina State University
Raleigh, North Carolina

Donald S. Phillips, Assistant Professor
Department of Technical Education
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma

F. A. Rhodes, Dean
College of Education
Mississippi State University
State College, Mississippi

Robert D. Sartin, Coordinator
Curriculum Laboratory
Department of Industrial Education
Mississippi State University
State College, Mississippi

Kenneth G. Skaggs, Specialist and Coordinator
Occupational Education Project
American Association of Junior Colleges
Washington, D. C.

J. Paschal Twyman, Director of Research and Assistant to the Chancellor
University of Missouri at St. Louis
St. Louis, Missouri

G-8
Richard J. Vasek, Associate Professor
Department of Industrial Education
Mississippi State University
State College, Mississippi

James E. Wall, Associate Professor
Department of Industrial Education
Mississippi State University
State College, Mississippi

Walter Was, President
Utica Junior College
Utica, Mississippi
### Institute Director
Neill C. Slack, Acting Head  
Industrial and Technical Education Department  
Utah State University  
Logan, Utah

### Institute Associate Director
Jay L. Nelson, Associate Director and President  
Utah Technical College at Salt Lake  
431 South Sixth East  
Salt Lake City, Utah

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Institution/Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Maurice Capson</td>
<td>Managing Associate</td>
<td>Davis-MacConnell-Ralston, Inc. 710 East Second South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Salt Lake City, Utah</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| C. Thomas Dean              | Chairman of Applied Arts and Sciences         | California State College at Long Beach  
Long Beach, California |
| Dennis A. Dirksen           | Doctoral Candidate                             | Industrial and Technical Education Department  
Utah State University  
Logan, Utah               |
| Lynn A. Emerson             | Technical Education Consultant                 | Willamette View Manor  
2705 S. E. River Road  
Portland, Oregon          |
| Kenneth C. Farrer           | Director of Curriculum and Instruction        | Los Angeles County Schools  
155 West Washington Boulevard  
Los Angeles, California |
| Robert D. Gates             | Director of Educational Operations            | Philco-Ford Corporation  
P. O. Box 10  
Fort Washington, Pennsylvania |
| Howard B. Gundersen         | Program Officer                                | Manpower Development and Training  
Department of Health Education and Welfare  
Federal Office Building  
50 Fulton Street  
San Francisco, California |
| Richard H. Hansen           | Vice President                                 | Utah Technical College at Salt Lake  
4600 South Redwood Road  
Salt Lake City, Utah      |

---
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Milton E. Larson, Professor
Department of Vocational Education
Colorado State University
Fort Collins, Colorado

Austin G. Loveless, Assistant Director
and Professor, Industrial and Technical Education Department
Utah State University
Logan, Utah

Howard A. Matthews, Director
Division of Manpower Development and Training
Department of Health, Education and Welfare
U. S. Office of Education
Washington, D. C.

William E. Mortimer, Professor
Industrial and Technical Education Department
Utah State University
Logan, Utah

Joseph T. Nerden, Professor
Industrial Education Department
North Carolina State University at Raleigh
P. O. Box 5096
Raleigh, North Carolina

Harlan L. Scherer, Professor
Industrial Education
Industrial Arts Department
Bemidji State College
Bemidji, Minnesota

John F. VanDerslice, Head
Electronics Department
Technician Division
College of San Mateo
San Mateo, California
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### THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT LOS ANGELES
### INSTITUTE PARTICIPANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title, Institution, Address</th>
<th>Home Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roland A. Anderson</td>
<td>Director of Curriculum, Vocational Technical, Oakland Community College, 2400 Opdyke Road, Bloomfield Hills, Michigan</td>
<td>1267 Woodlow Pontiac, Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antonio Baez-Bermejo</td>
<td>Assistant Director, Trade and Industries, Puerto Rico Technological Institute, 33 Cesar Gonzalez St., Hato Rey, Puerto Rico</td>
<td>1151 Alomar Street San Agustin Rio Piedras, Puerto Rico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominic J. Bordini</td>
<td>Director, Vocational-Technical-Adult School, 103 Oak Street, Kaukauna, Wisconsin</td>
<td>219 E. 14th Street Kaukauna, Wisconsin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sizemore Bowlan</td>
<td>Director, Oklahoma City Area Vocational-Technical Center, 4901 So. Bryant, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma</td>
<td>3124 Quail Creek Oklahoma City, Oklahoma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles W. Cawlfield</td>
<td>Supervisor of Technical Education, Missouri State Department of Education, Jefferson Building, 7th Floor, Jefferson City, Missouri</td>
<td>405 Belair Drive Jefferson City, Missouri</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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W. M. Douglass  
Dean of Administration  
Oregon Technical Institute  
Klamath Falls, Oregon  
1975 Lal Moro St.  
Klamath Falls, Oregon

R. Dean Frey  
State Supervisor,  
Technical Education  
412 Arizona State Bldg.  
Phoenix, Arizona  
325 West State  
Avenue  
Phoenix, Arizona

William G. Gordon  
Supervisor, Technical  
Education, Bureau of  
Junior College  
Vocational-Technical  
Education, State  
Department of Education  
1111 Jackson Street  
Oakland, California  
1125 Fourth Avenue  
Napa, California

Marshall G. Holman  
Chairman, Division of  
Technology, Arizona  
Western College, P. O.  
Box 929, Yuma, Arizona  
1004 Corona Drive  
Yuma, Arizona

Wendell Howard  
Director, Granite Falls  
Area Technical Institute  
15th Street and 11th Ave.  
Granite Falls, Minnesota  
835 - 8th Street  
Granite Falls, Minnesota

Earl F. Jaeger  
Chairman, Racine Technical  
Institute, 620 Lake Avenue  
Racine, Wisconsin  
500 Oregon Street  
Racine, Wisconsin  
53403

Charles L. Keever  
Supervisor of Training,  
Department of Administration  
State Personnel Division  
Musser and Fall Streets  
Carson City, Nevada  
4849 Snyder Avenue  
Carson City, Nevada

Louis W. Kleine  
Professor and Department  
Head, New Mexico State  
University, P. O. Box 566  
Las Cruces, New Mexico  
2018 Crescent  
Las Cruces, New Mexico

Edward F. Kotchi  
Dean of Technical, Semi-  
Professional and  
Occupational Education  
Junior College of Broward  
County, 3501 S. W. Davie  
Road, Fort Lauderdale,  
Florida  
280 Holloway Drive  
Plantation, Florida
Lloyd Lawson
Director, Technical and Special Programs, State Board for Vocational Education, 32 State Services Building, Denver, Colorado

Howard R. Maynard
Director of Vocational-Technical Education, Macomb County Intermediate School District, 10 Mullett Street, Mount Clemens, Michigan

Harlan F. Melvin
Program Specialist State Board for Vocational Education, P. O. Box 248 Olympia, Washington

Gilbert L. Rainey
Head, Department of Electrical Engineering Technology, Purdue University, South Campus Courts, Bldg. A., Lafayette, Indiana

Michael J. Rielley
Instructor, Fire Training Bureau of Industrial Ed. State Department of Ed. 721 Capitol Mall Sacramento, California

Richard W. Roberts
Supervisor of Trade and Industrial Education, State Department of Public Instruction, 147 North Capitol, Madison, Wisconsin

Mrs. Milferd E. Rosendahl
Program Assistant, Health Occupations Education The University of Iowa 135 Melrose Avenue Iowa City, Iowa

Roland L. Roy
Educational Supervisor Department of Community Colleges, 112 West Lane Street, Raleigh, North Carolina

Jack L. Rucker
Director, School of Trade and Technical Education Idaho State University 10th and Terry Street Pocatello, Idaho
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oliver K. Schaer</td>
<td>State Supervisor of Trade, Industrial and Technical Education</td>
<td>4903 Laura Lane Olympia, Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Board for Vocational Education</td>
<td>P. O. Box 248, Olympia, Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George E. Smith</td>
<td>Departmental Training Officer II, Nevada State Highway Department</td>
<td>1809 K. Street Sparks, Nevada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Marian R. Thomas</td>
<td>State Supervisor, Health Occupations, Division of Vocational Education</td>
<td>345½ Plaza Balentine Santa Fe, New Mexico</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

New Mexico Department of Education, 139 South Castillo, Suite E, Harvey Building, Santa Fe, New Mexico
# THE UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT INSTITUTE PARTICIPANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title, Institution, Address</th>
<th>Home Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Luke J. Baugh</td>
<td>Assistant Professor in Vocational-Technical Division, Virginia State College, Norfolk Division</td>
<td>2714 Stanhope Ave., Norfolk, Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2401 Corprow Avenue, Norfolk, Virginia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles D. Bryant</td>
<td>Assistant Professor, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, North Carolina</td>
<td>921 Warren Ave., Cary, North Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Lee Bushong</td>
<td>Assistant Professor, Purdue University, Fort Wayne, Indiana</td>
<td>4720 Innsbruck Dr., Fort Wayne, Indiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorran C. Celley</td>
<td>Supervisor, State Board of Vocational, Technical and Adult Education, 1 West Wilson Street, Madison, Wisconsin</td>
<td>4708 Tonyawatha Trail, Madison, Wisconsin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Jane Hamilton</td>
<td>Chairman, Department of Business, Radford College, Radford, Virginia</td>
<td>70 Monroe Terrace, Radford, Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard E. Hedinger</td>
<td>Educational Consultant, Vocational and Technical State Staff Department of Community Colleges, 112 West Lane Street, Raleigh, North Carolina</td>
<td>3116 Julian Drive, Raleigh, North Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abner Hollingsworth</td>
<td>Coordinator Trade and Industrial Education, Brown Tech., High School, 14th and Market Streets, Wilmington, Delaware</td>
<td>R.D. #4, West Chester, Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
James L. Holloway  Director, Valdosta Area VTS, Rt. 1, Box 211 Valdosta, Georgia

Beth C. Jordan  Professor, Home Economics Department, Virginia Polytechnic Institute 22 Agnew Hall Blacksburg, Virginia

Frank L. Juszli  President, Norwalk State Technical College Richards Avenue Norwalk, Connecticut

Wayne F. Krueger  Technical Coordinator Macomb County Community College, 12 Mile Road Warren, Michigan

Robert S. Latham  Chairman, Drafting Dept. Salem Technical Vocational Community College, 4389 Satter Drive, N. E. Salem, Oregon

James J. Malotke  Director, School of Vocational, Technical and Adult Education, 410 South Commercial Street Neenah, Wisconsin

John L. Murphy  Dean of Applied Sciences Central Florida Junior College, P. O. Box 1388 Ocala, Florida

Juanita B. Parker  Chairman, Department of Business Administration West Virginia Wesleyan College, Buckhannon, West Virginia

D. Ray Purkey  Supervisor, Technical Education and Construction State Department of Education 65 South Front Street Columbus, Ohio

William E. Rakestraw  Head, Department of Aeronautical Technology Schilling Institute Salina, Kansas
Richard D. Ray  Consultant for Technical Education Technical and Health Education Section State Department of Education Tallahassee, Florida

Rice Roberts  Instructor of Electricity Norfolk Division of Virginia State College 2301 Corprew Avenue Norfolk, Virginia

Ralph T. Russell  Principal, Thistletown Collegiate Institute 20 Fordwich Crescent Rexdale (Toronto) Ontario, Canada

Joseph Salvatore  Associate Professor and Chairman, Department of Technology, Rhode Island Junior College, 199 Promenade Street Providence, Rhode Island

Edward A. Shattuck  Associate in Industrial Education, Bureau of Trade and Technical Education New York State Education Department, 112 State Street, Albany, New York

Jack W. Smythe  Supervisor of Office Occupations, State Board of Vocational, Technical and Adult Education, 1 West Wilson, Room 720 Madison, Wisconsin

Colen J. Sommerville  Director of Industrial Arts and Coordinator of Trade and Industrial Education, Port Huron Area Public Schools 509 Stanton Street Port Huron, Michigan

2018 Chowkeebin Tallahassee, Florida

501 Roosevelt Blvd. Portsmouth, Virginia

28 Kingsgarden Road, Toronto, Ontario, Canada

68 Freedom Drive Cranston, Rhode Island

94 Glendale Road Latham, New York

13 Fraust Circle Madison, Wisconsin

5802 Lake Shore Road Fort Huron, Michigan
Sylvan P. Stern  
Associate Professor of  
Construction Technology and  
Coordinator of Fire Science  
New York City Community College  
of Applied Arts and Sciences  
300 Pearl Street  
Brooklyn, New York

Edgar Vaughan III  
Supervisor of Technical  
Education, Bureau of  
Vocational Education  
Kentucky Department of  
Education, State Office  
Building  
Frankfort, Kentucky

Donald R. Welter  
President, Thames Valley  
State Technical College  
574 New London Turnpike  
Norwich, Connecticut
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title, Institution, Address</th>
<th>Home Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Norman E. Abell</td>
<td>Director, Chattanooga State Technical Institute, Chattanooga, Tennessee</td>
<td>3607 Locksley Circle, Chattanooga, Tennessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul J. Barotta</td>
<td>Director, Union Technical Institute, Union, New Jersey</td>
<td>1062 Stowe Street Union, New Jersey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James R. Bauman</td>
<td>Coordinator and Director Carthage Public Schools Carthage, Missouri</td>
<td>Route 2 Carthage, Missouri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathan L. Breed, Jr.</td>
<td>Director, Parkersburg Center, West Virginia University, Parkersburg, West Virginia</td>
<td>114 Morningside Circle Parkersburg, West Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard L. Cochran</td>
<td>Acting Night Director Richland Technical Education Center Columbia, South Carolina</td>
<td>4759 Shalimar Drive Columbia, South Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belton O. Compton</td>
<td>Associate Director-Dean Sumter Area Technical Education Center Sumter, South Carolina</td>
<td>605 Baldwin Drive Sumter, South Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billy L. Ditto</td>
<td>Director, Del Mar College Corpus Christi, Texas</td>
<td>4637 McGregor Drive Corpus Christi Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert S. Eicher</td>
<td>Assistant Director Milford Vocational-Technical School Milford, Nebraska</td>
<td>Milford, Nebraska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick G. Farley</td>
<td>Vocational Program Coordinator, Southington Board of Education Southington, Connecticut</td>
<td>77 Summit Farms Road Southington, Conn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralph O. Gallington</td>
<td>Professor, Southern Illinois University Carbondale, Illinois</td>
<td>Route #2 Carbondale, Illinois</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>McClelland M. Gray</td>
<td>Principal, Valley Vocational-Tech School</td>
<td>Fishersville, Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronald L. Griffith</td>
<td>Director, Phillips County Community College</td>
<td>Helena, Arkansas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul C. Hallett</td>
<td>Dean, Ohio College of Applied Science</td>
<td>Ft. Mitchell, Kentucky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurman A. Horney</td>
<td>Director, Davidson County Community College</td>
<td>Lexington, North Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert V. Keck</td>
<td>Supervisor, Oklahoma City Board of Education</td>
<td>401 Keith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerald K. LaRonde</td>
<td>Guidance Coordinator</td>
<td>1028 West Park Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick W. Lamb</td>
<td>Chairman, Flint Community Junior College</td>
<td>2079 East McLean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaron J. Langston</td>
<td>Director, East Mississippi Junior College</td>
<td>717 South 17 Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John J. Light</td>
<td>Director, Tri-County Board of Education</td>
<td>Route #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colin N. Mackie</td>
<td>Superintendent, Protestant School Board</td>
<td>240 Betournay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John W. Meyer</td>
<td>Director, Chicago City College</td>
<td>12534 South Harvard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronald J. Monfette</td>
<td>Apprenticeship Coordinator</td>
<td>30125 Fernhill Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry C. Race</td>
<td>Chairman, Virginia West Community College</td>
<td>2704 Laburnum, S.W.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alar E. Reed</td>
<td>Director, Alpena Community College</td>
<td>125 East McLean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alpena, Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy Bess Robinson</td>
<td>Assistant Supervisor, Alabama State Department of Education</td>
<td>53 The Prado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Montgomery, Alabama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl T. Rorabaugh</td>
<td>Director, Eastern Westmoreland Vocational-Technical School</td>
<td>Route 3, Box 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Latrobe, Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billy H. Ross</td>
<td>Head, James Connally Technical Institute</td>
<td>1714 Smith Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Waco, Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul A. Shoemaker</td>
<td>Adult Education Consultant, Ohio State Department of Vocational Education</td>
<td>163 Sunbury Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chillicothe, Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dmitri Slobodian</td>
<td>Instructor, Garden City Public Schools</td>
<td>14055 Sunbury Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Livonia, Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craven H. Summerell</td>
<td>Director, Catawba Valley Technical Institute</td>
<td>304 Holland Circle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Statesville, North Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myles L. Tillotson</td>
<td>Night Director, Spartanburg County Technical Education Center</td>
<td>Route #1, Box 18A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spartanburg, South Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merton Von Stephens</td>
<td>Supervisor, Bessemer State Technical Institute</td>
<td>Route #5, Box 270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bessemer, Alabama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morris S. Webb</td>
<td>Head, James Connally Technical Institute</td>
<td>319 North Walnut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Drive, Waco, Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean H. Wessels</td>
<td>Coordinator, Madison Adult, Vocational-Technical School</td>
<td>4024 Tokay Boulevard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Madison, Wisconsin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Title, Institution, Address</td>
<td>Home Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymond A. Ahlfors</td>
<td>Assistant Director, Alexandria Area Technical School, Alexandria, Minnesota</td>
<td>1317 Douglas St., Alexandria, Minnesota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall Arnold</td>
<td>Director, Henderson Community College, Henderson, Kentucky</td>
<td>301 South Water Street, Henderson, Kentucky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven D. Bishopp</td>
<td>Supervisor-Teacher Training, Trade Industrial and Technical Education, Stat- Board of Vocational Education, Olympia, Washington</td>
<td>P. O. Box 723, Olympia, Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurt A. Booe</td>
<td>Professor - Civil Technology Schilling Institute, Salina, Kansas</td>
<td>P. O. Box 163, Assaria, Kansas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank X. Brandstetter</td>
<td>Associate Dean, Erie County Technical Institute, Buffalo, New York</td>
<td>821 Eggert Road, Buffalo, New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Clara E. Brentlinger</td>
<td>State Supervisor, Health Occupations Training, Oklahoma State Board of Vocational Education, Stillwater, Oklahoma</td>
<td>1904 Kiowa Drive, Enid, Oklahoma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred J. Brierley</td>
<td>Dean, Trade and Technical Education, Santa Monica City College, Santa Monica, California</td>
<td>5106 Paseo de las Tortugas, Torrance, California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren F. Buxton</td>
<td>Instructor, Phoenix College, Phoenix, Arizona</td>
<td>10001 North 34th Place, Phoenix, Arizona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orville D. Carnahan</td>
<td>Director of Vocational-Technical Education, Yakima Valley College, Yakima, Washington</td>
<td>2403 West Yakima Ave., Yakima, Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. H. Carrington</td>
<td>Assistant Professor Engineering Technology, Cuyahoga Community College, Cleveland, Ohio</td>
<td>12950 Clifton Blvd., Cleveland, Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Title/Position</td>
<td>Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayton W. Chance</td>
<td>Associate Professor of Engineering and Technology</td>
<td>Tenth and Edmond Streets, St. Joseph, Missouri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calvin E. Evans</td>
<td>Chairman, Division of Technology, Metropolitan State College, Denver, Colorado</td>
<td>1724 Norwood Avenue, Boulder, Colorado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glendon R. Guldberg</td>
<td>Dean, Vocational and Technical Education, Citrus College</td>
<td>20410 Collegewood Drive, Walnut, California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt O. Hanhila</td>
<td>Executive Dean Glendale Community College</td>
<td>1039 North 26th Street, Phoenix, Arizona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles J. Hanson</td>
<td>Dean of Men North Dakota State School of Science, Wahpeton, North Dakota</td>
<td>10 Dakota Ave., Wahpeton, North Dakota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymond L. Keil</td>
<td>Associate Professor, Industrial Education Indiana State University</td>
<td>318 South 19th Street, Terre Haute, Indiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harold E. Marconnette</td>
<td>Chairman, Division VI Central Oregon College</td>
<td>54 Gilchrist Bend, Oregon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orsen Stewart Myers</td>
<td>Chairman, Technical Division, Grand Rapids Junior College, Grand Rapids, Michigan</td>
<td>106 Ivanhoe, N.E. Grand Rapids, Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry M. Neely</td>
<td>President, Schilling Technical Institute</td>
<td>2322 Edgehill Road, Salina, Kansas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward A. Ososky</td>
<td>Associate Director, Trade and Industrial Education Pittsburg Board of Public Education, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania</td>
<td>101 Williams Street, Springdale, Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard R. Randall</td>
<td>Instructor, West High School, Billings, Montana</td>
<td>1017 Avenue E. Billings, Montana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Title/Position</td>
<td>Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert B. Rhoads</td>
<td>Associate Director</td>
<td>Gilman Falls Ave. Old Town, Maine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical Institute Division</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Maine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Orono, Maine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alvie M. Sarchett</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>2519 Tyler Ames, Iowa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Iowa State University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ames, Iowa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William J. Silhan</td>
<td>Director Technical Education</td>
<td>1544 South Evers Avenue, Westchester, Illinois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J. S. Morton Junior College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cicero, Illinois</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerrell E. Terrell</td>
<td>Director, Vocational Technical Education</td>
<td>R. #1, Box 108 Elkins, Arkansas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sequoyah Polytechnic School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fayetteville, Arkansas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter E. Ulrich</td>
<td>Specialist - Trade and Technical Education</td>
<td>3535 Ceres Drive Salt Lake City, Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Utah State Board of Vocational Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Salt Lake City, Utah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis H. Urner</td>
<td>Director, Vocational-Technical Education</td>
<td>205 Dwyer Waynesville, Missouri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waynesville R-6 Schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waynesville, Missouri</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyle H. Wandrei</td>
<td>Teacher and Technical Education Supervisor</td>
<td>1534 Badger Ave. Eau Claire, Wisconsin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vocational, Technical and Adult School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eau Claire, Wisconsin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Mary E. Warner</td>
<td>Chairman, French King Regional School Committee</td>
<td>Montague Road Sunderland, Mass.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greenfield, Massachusetts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowell A. Welsh</td>
<td>Director, Nebraska Vocational-Technical School</td>
<td>Milford, Nebraska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Milford, Nebraska</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard M. Wysong</td>
<td>Director of Adult and Vocational Education</td>
<td>52700 Walsingham Lane, South Bend, Indiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Bend Community School Corporation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Bend, Indiana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Howard Zollner</td>
<td>Director, Adult and Vocational Education</td>
<td>2404 Stanford Fort Collins, Colorado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poudre School District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R-1, Fort Collins, Colorado</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX I

AGENDA

PROJECT EVALUATION CONFERENCE

NATIONAL PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT INSTITUTES
IN TECHNICAL EDUCATION

October 12-13, 1967

Thursday, October 12

7:30 p.m. Welcome Remarks                     Robert E. Taylor
7:45    Conference activities and               Aaron J. Miller
        expectations
8:00    Review financial arrangements          Aaron J. Miller
8:45-9:30 Review of Instructional             Ivan E. Valentine
        Material

Friday, October 13

8:00 a.m. Pick up conference participants     Staff
8:30    Supplemental Instructional             Ivan E. Valentine
        Material
9:15    Review of Evaluation Techniques        Ivan E. Valentine
10:00   Break                                  Ivan E. Valentine
10:15   Review of consultants and             Aaron J. Miller
        resource persons
11:00   Exploration of data                    Don R. Herring and
        analysis                               Ivan E. Valentine
11:40   Lunch                                 Ivan E. Valentine
1:15 p.m. Participant selection               Aaron J. Miller
1:45    Participant follow-up                 Ivan E. Valentine
2:15    Director's report on Institute        Institute Director
3:15    Break                                  Ivan E. Valentine
3:30    Implications of the structure         Aaron J. Miller
        and organization of the project and
        institute. Implications for
        future projects
4:15    Conference summary                    Aaron J. Miller
4:30    Adjourn                               Ivan E. Valentine
PARTICIPANTS

Project Evaluation Meeting

October 12-13, 1967

The Center for Vocational and Technical Education
The Ohio State University

Don R. Herring, Research Associate
The Center for Vocational and Technical Education
The Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio

Lucian Lombardi, Director
State Technical Colleges
Room 337, State Office Building
Hartford, Connecticut

Aaron J. Miller
Coordinator of Development and Training
The Center for Vocational and Technical Education
The Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio

E. B. Moore, Assistant Professor
Department of Secondary Education
Mississippi State University
State College, Mississippi

Neill C. Slack, Head
Department of Industrial and Technical Education
Utah State University
Logan, Utah

Ivan E. Valentine, Project Coordinator
National Leadership Development Institutes in Technical Education
The Center for Vocational and Technical Education
The Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio