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INTRODUCTION

This report represents the first year record of the Manpower Leadership Education Project. This inaugural effort toward cooperative manpower leadership training between a labor department base and university occupational education base was made possible by a contract between the Michigan Department of Labor, Bureau of Manpower, and the University of Michigan, School of Education, Occupational Education Programs. A cross-campus, interdisciplinary approach was used in delivery of training. The MLEP staff was impressed by the interest and enthusiasm engendered during 1975-1976.

The report contains four primary components: a) overview chapter, b) 1975-1976 results chapter, c) evaluation and recommendations chapter, and d) appendices with supportive data. The project staff offers this report for your information and use. We welcome your reactions.
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CHAPTER I
PROJECT OVERVIEW

This chapter is organized as a chronological reverse. Three sub-headings formed the framework as follows: Program Abstract, what the program was; Project Design, how the program was developed and implemented; and, Project Rational, why the program was needed.

Program Abstract

The Manpower Leadership Program (MLP) was dually tailored toward leadership and manpower. The MLP was a graduate, in-service, credit-accruing approach to the preparation of manpower planners, administrators, and operators.

The MLP courses incorporated field-based externships, field-based mini-seminars, campus-based intensive courses, and field-based independent study. Each course was facilitated by a high-talent cadre of persons possessing leadership and manpower expertise. Nine university and approximately thirty non-university persons comprised the cadre.

The MLP core consisted of twenty semester hours fashioned toward the participant's needs and applicable toward a thirty-semester-hour Master's Degree in Education. The ten-semester-hour balance needed to complete the master's degree could be elected from regular university offerings. The elections related to the participant's needs and interests. The MLP core was as follows:
### TERM I COURSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Name</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E518</td>
<td>Externship</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E663</td>
<td>Seminar I</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J607</td>
<td>Career Development</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW610</td>
<td>Human Resources Programs</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9 Semester Hours

### TERM II COURSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Name</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E518</td>
<td>Externship</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E663</td>
<td>Seminar II</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B650</td>
<td>Theories Admin. Org. and Leadership</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The focus for the various core courses follows:

### E518 Field-Based Externship

The externship was a competency-based extension of the on-campus program. In combination with the seminar sessions, the externship provided a planned, individually prescribed program of educational field experiences. Externship experiences were selected with the mutual agreement of the student, the participating agency, and The University of Michigan. Primary emphasis was placed upon satisfying the educational needs of the individual learner.

### E663 Seminar I

Seminar I provided the participants with the opportunity to develop a comprehensive awareness and understanding of components of manpower program development. The seminar focused upon the utilization and application of problem-solving techniques with special attention toward the following topic areas:

1. Manpower legislation: present, future, and past.
2. Federal, state, and local roles and responsibilities.
3. Funding resources and guidelines.
4. Identification of client-centered needs.
5. Manpower program development.

### J607 Environmental Information

This course was designed to facilitate the development of skills which would enable the learners to translate current theories of career development into viable career guidance programs. Broad goals of the course included: 1) knowledge of career development theories; 2) ability to
translate those theories into specific program goals based on client needs; 3) ability to design a career guidance program to meet these goals using a variety of guidance strategies; and 4) ability to implement, evaluate, and renew the career guidance program. Special emphasis was given to providing information relevant to the older youth and adult population and to a variety of organizational settings. The final outcome of the course was an increased learner ability to design and implement career guidance programs for their current work setting.

**SW610 Human Resources Programs**

The course examined the range of human service agency alternatives available as a response to economic disadvantage. The course was examined from two perspectives: the needs of the client and the agency organization of the program to serve the client. The conceptual framework was from a social work and human service perspective.

**E663 Seminar II**

This seminar focused upon the development and application of:

1. planning skills, 2) operating skills, and 3) evaluation skills as they related to the delivery of manpower programs and services.

The seminar enabled the participant to apply key skills toward the development and implementation of:

1. Operational and organizational guidelines.
2. Employment delivery systems.
3. Educational delivery systems.
4. Occupational information systems.
5. Manpower support services.

**B650 Theories of Administrative Organization and Leadership**

This course exposed the learners to selected portions of the relevant professional literature in organizational, administrative, and leadership theory. Within the general context of the issues, problems and opportunities which reside in the area of manpower utilization and development, the course provided the opportunity for learners to integrate more theoretical knowledge with their own professional and practical experiences. Special attention was given to relating knowledge and skills to the person's current work place.

**EC424 Labor Market Information**

The course examined sources, uses, strengths and limitations of labor market information which prime sponsors must use to develop, evaluate and
monitor their plans of service. A conceptual background was presented for each topic area so that data uses could be better understood. The conceptual framework was from an economics perspective.

E561 Independent Study

Following a self-assessment of strengths, concerns, and interests, the student developed a learning contract designed to build upon previous courses. Learning experiences were jointly identified by the student and instructor and fashioned to meet the student's needs.

The MLP delivery design blended the field-based externship, four weeks of intensive campus instruction, seven weekend sessions, six field-based mini-seminars, and independent study into practical/theoretical manpower leadership education. The MLP responsibilities were directed and coordinated by Daniel E. Vogler and Joseph V. Tuma.

Project Design

The central problems addressed in designing and implementing a Manpower Leadership Program were as indicated below.

a. Could a cadre of 18-24 Michigan manpower employees, possessing characteristics for success as manpower leaders, be identified and recruited for a 1975-1976 program?

b. Could the necessary instructional organization, academic clearances, and local constraints be addressed in order to provide an MLP?

c. Could the necessary human resources and soft-ware be identified to execute the MLP?

d. Could state-oriented workshops be developed to complement the MLP?

e. Could plans be developed to continue and/or expand manpower leadership education for 1976-1977?

f. Could a recruitment program be developed which would promote a continuation of the 1975-1976 project?
The central problems were the basis for the project's objectives. The objectives are listed below:

1. To recruit, for 1975-76, 18-24 Michigan Manpower employees who have a high probability for success as manpower leaders.

2. To provide an MLP.

3. To identify and/or develop, through The University of Michigan, human resources and software which can provide personnel support to Michigan manpower organizations.

4. To design and offer three manpower leadership workshops for 50 existing manpower leaders.

5. To develop plans and proposals for continued and/or expanded manpower personnel education during 1976-1977.


The objectives were addressed through execution of the tasks detailed in Figure I-1. The tasks were interfaced with the Program Curriculum Outline presented in Figure I-2. Course syllabi were developed by respective disciplinary experts from competencies identified from a review of the literature. The competencies, identified as part of a Michigan Bureau of Manpower Contract 75-103E-B4-1, may be found in Appendix A. The course syllabi used to deliver the courses may be found in Appendix B.

Project Rationale

Since 1961, manpower programs have been a formal and statutory activity having both federal and state government support. Several billions of dollars have been appropriated to formalized manpower programs. These monies were provided in recognition of an extremely fluid and often uncertain labor force. Technology, market actions and reactions, international uncertainties, and a myriad of other factors have influenced employment levels,
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FIGURE I-1: Task-Timeline Chart of Manpower Leadership Program Tasks
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASKS</th>
<th>1975</th>
<th>1976</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Register participants</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eval. prior graduate credits</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advise partic. Univ. requirements</td>
<td>** **</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advise future course elections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refine MLP syllabi</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report MLP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify third-party evaluator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seek MLP personnel evaluation</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seek MLP participant evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Select workshop planners</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan three m/p leader. workshops</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer three m/p leader. workshops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft m/p person. trg. proposals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit m/p proposals for 1976-77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inform m/p emp. about 1976-77 MLP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seek MLP nominations for 1976-77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seek MLP applications for 1976-77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview qual. apps. for 1976-77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invite selected apps. for 1976-77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIGURE I-1: Task-Timeline Chart of Manpower Leadership Program Tasks (Continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TERM I COURSES</th>
<th>TERM II COURSES</th>
<th>TERM III COURSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E518 Externship (2)</td>
<td>E518 Externship (2)</td>
<td>E561 Independent Study (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E663 Seminar I (3)</td>
<td>E663 Seminar II (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J607 Career Development (2)</td>
<td>B650 Theories Admin. Org. and Leadership (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW610 Human Resources Programs (2)</td>
<td>EC424 Labor Market Information (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9 Semester Hours</strong></td>
<td><strong>3 Semester Hours</strong></td>
<td><strong>2 Semester Hours</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TIME SCHEDULE**

**Fall Term**

September  
5 (6) Campus: Registration, planning  
8-12 Extern Visits  
15-19 Extern Visits  
22-26(27) Campus: Seminar Friday p.m., and Saturday  
29-30

October  
1-3 Campus: Guidance and Social Work Courses  
6-10 Field-Based Mini-Seminar; Extern Visits  
13-17 Field-Based Mini-Seminar; Extern Visits  
20-24 Field-Based Mini-Seminar; Extern Visits  
27-31(1) Campus: Seminar Friday p.m., and Saturday

November  
3-7 Field-Based Mini-Seminar; Extern Visits  
10-14 Field-Based Mini-Seminar; Extern Visits  
17-21 Campus: Guidance and Social Work Courses  
24-28 Field-Based Mini-Seminar; Extern Visits

December  
1-5 Field-Based Mini-Seminar; Extern Visits  
8-12(13) Campus: Seminar Friday p.m., and Saturday

**Winter Term**

January  
5-9(10) Campus: Seminar Friday p.m., and Saturday  
12-16  
19-23 Campus: Economics and Administration Courses  
26-30 Field-Based Mini-Seminar; Extern Visits

FIGURE I-2: Program Curriculum Outline
occupational demand, job characteristics, and broad shifts in governmental program emphasis.

The past decade has revealed that appropriations, standing by themselves, were no guarantor that manpower programs would increase employment and decrease underemployment. The assumption that leadership capabilities would automatically emerge if the money were available was not viable.

Leadership, is the influence that individuals exercise to cause movement of individuals and the organizations they comprise toward specified goals. Leadership in manpower planning, programming, and operation is the essential ingredient for successful results for employment and training for employment. This leadership requires the development of personnel who understand the dynamics of the labor market, the needs of people, and the ability to serve effectively as an agent of change within the operational style and behavior patterns of organizations and institutions.
A planning contract (75-103E-B4-) to study professional training and development of Michigan manpower personnel was negotiated between the Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations of The University of Michigan, and the Bureau of Manpower of the Michigan Department of Labor. The purpose of the contract was to develop a feasible, responsive, professional-level, academic training program for Michigan manpower personnel who aspire to careers in manpower planning, administration, and operation.

A mail survey was conducted to identify the current status of experience, education, age, sex, and race for Michigan Manpower personnel. Nineteen of the thirty-three Prime and Sub-prime Sponsors responded to the survey. The following describes the population.

1. Approximately 75% of the surveyed group had less than four years of experience in manpower.

2. Approximately half the surveyed group possessed a bachelor's degree. A projection of data suggested that about 300 persons had bachelor degrees.

3. The majors within the bachelor degrees varied considerably. No dominant major emerged.

4. Approximately 75% of the group surveyed were between 24 and 45 years old.

5. Men and women were about the same in number.

6. Whites and non-whites were about the same in number.

Regional meetings were held to seek opinions about personnel development. The directors' views supported the data reported earlier. The directors urged that programs for personnel development be launched.

An ad hoc review conference was held to receive expert opinion. Representation from The University of Michigan, other Michigan colleges and universities, Michigan Department of Labor, U.S. Department of Labor, U.S. Office of Education, Michigan Department of Education, United Auto Workers,
Michigan Association of Private Vocational Schools, private foundations, and the U.S. Congress were invited. The ad hoc conference participants strongly endorsed the MLP approach while noting that this effort should be viewed as the first step to comprehensive manpower personnel development.

Nominations, contingent upon funding, were sought for a group of approximately 20 qualified persons were eligible and interested in a 1975-1976 program.

Cooperation was solicited among the University of Michigan's Institute of Social Research, Economics Department, School of Social Work, School of Education, and Extension Service. This unique combination, coupled with the aforementioned information, resulted in a funded contract between the Bureau of Manpower, Michigan Department of Labor, and the School of Education, The University of Michigan. The contract's purpose was to develop and implement both an inservice, graduate, Manpower Leadership Program (MLP), and three Manpower Leadership Workshops for Michigan manpower personnel.
CHAPTER II

RESULTS: 1975-1976

The results from the 1975-1976 Manpower Leadership Education Project are reported in this chapter. The results are products of the efforts to meet the project's objectives. The products were as follows: a) identification and recruitment of participants, b) the execution of an MLP, c) the development of human resources and software, d) the design and execution of three state-wide conferences, e) the development of plans for manpower leadership education expansion, and f) the recruitment and selection of potential 1976-1977 MLP participants.

1975-1976 Participant Identification and Recruitment

The identification of MLP participants was accomplished through a nomination process. Draft copies of solicitation materials may be found in Appendix C. Prime and sub-prime CETA directors were contacted to advise them of the program. Nominations were solicited from these persons. The following conditions were to exist for any person nominated:

1. The nominee had completed a bachelor's degree.
2. The nominee was currently employed and under the prime or sub-prime CETA director's direct or contractual supervision.
3. The nominee exhibited promise as a leader of manpower.
4. Directors would be willing to help plan and enter into an externship agreement for the nominee in the manpower operation.
5. Directors participate in twenty-one weeks of intensive, on-campus instruction from September, 1975, to June, 1976.

A nomination form with a return, stamped envelope, was provided.

Nominees were immediately forwarded an MLP application form and information describing the program. The application was to be returned by June 3, 1975, in order that interview schedules and arrangements could be made.

The applications were reviewed and checked to insure that basic admission criteria were met. Prospective participants were scheduled and invited for a personal interview.

Interviews were scheduled for June 25 and 26, 1975. Participants were interviewed by either Dr. Daniel E. Vogler, or Mr. Joseph V. Tuma. The interviews were structured to obtain input necessary for the completion of the "Interview Guide." This guide may also be found in Appendix C.

Recommendation, application data, and interview input were used to rank prospective participants. Based upon these inputs, twenty-four candidates were invited to participate in the MLP. Each prospective participant was required to make application to Rackham Graduate School, The University of Michigan. No person was invited unless it appeared that admission criteria could be met.

The prospective participants who were not invited were advised that they had not been selected. All twenty-four original invitees accepted the invitation. The number of actual enrollments was reduced to twenty. The decrease of four was due to personal or work conditions. Table I reflects the identification and recruitment record.
TABLE 1
1975-1976 IDENTIFICATION AND RECRUITMENT RECORD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominations</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applications</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invitees</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptances</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Enrollment</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The MLF participant profile was constructed. Table 2 reports twelve characteristics and commensurate statistics for the twenty participants who enrolled. The four prospective participants who did not enroll were generally reflective of those who did enroll. The principle differences were that three were female and all four were minority.

MLP Execution

The MLP execution was in accord with the Curriculum Outline presented in Chapter I. The various course syllabi were followed, and for the most part, the instructional staff were on target with projected time lines. The syllabi are presented in Appendix B. Exceptions to syllabi existed for Seminar II and the extern program. The exceptions were made to permit more participant input. Evaluation data regarding this objective is reported in Chapter III.
TABLE 2

PARTICIPANT CHARACTERISTICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (Mean)</td>
<td>33.10</td>
<td>22-58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA (Mean 4.0 = A)</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>2.0-3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary (Yearly Mean)</td>
<td>$12,920</td>
<td>$7,000-$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in M/P (Mean)</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>.5-10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor-Based</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban-Based</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban/Rural-Based</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural-Based</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MLP Resource Development

Resource development of both a human and software nature occurred during the project. The various instructional persons are listed in Figure II-1. Additional manpower/leadership resource consultants were used for the project. Those persons are reported in Figure II-2. Invaluable resource associations were provided by local directors and field supervisors. Figure II-3 reports those persons.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Instructional Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Malcolm Cohen, Lecturer</td>
<td>Labor Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. William Dunifon, Assistant Prof</td>
<td>Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Louis Ferman, Professor</td>
<td>Social Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Juliet Miller, Lecturer</td>
<td>Career Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Gordon McMahon, Professor</td>
<td>Externship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. John Odbert, Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Seminar II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Joseph Tuma, Lecturer</td>
<td>Externship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Ralph Wenrich, Professor</td>
<td>Seminar I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIGURE II-1: MLP Instructional Staff

Mr. Donald Baker, Chief Clerk  
Committee on Education and Labor  
U.S. House of Representatives  
Washington, D.C.  

Dr. Wilbur J. Cohen, Dean  
School of Education  
The University of Michigan  
Ann Arbor, Michigan  

Mr. Price Banks, Director  
of Planning Department  
Livingston County  
Howell, Michigan  

Dr. Hugh Edwards  
Achievement Motivation Consultant  
Fenton, Michigan  

Mr. Samuel Bernstein  
Assistant to the Mayor for  
Manpower  
Chicago, Illinois  

The Honorable Marvin L. Esch  
Congressman/Michigan  
Washington, D.C.  

Mr. Paul Bigley, Director  
Region II Manpower Consortium  
Jackson, Michigan  

Dr. Rupert Evans  
Professor of Education  
The University of Illinois  
Urbana, Illinois  

Mr. Wendell Brooks, Chairperson  
Northwest Michigan Manpower  
Consortium  
Manistee, Michigan  

Dr. William Haber  
Professor of Economics  
The University of Michigan  
Ann Arbor, Michigan  

Mr. Robert E. Chisholm, Director  
Oakland Department of Public  
Services  
Pontiac, Michigan  

The Honorable Augustus Hawkins  
Congressman/California  
Washington, D.C.  

FIGURE II-2: MLP Resource Consultants
Mr. Thomas Hazlewood, Director
Central Upper Peninsula Manpower
Consortium
Escanaba, Michigan

Mr. Dale Huggler, Chairman
Board of Commissioners
Alpena, Michigan

Mr. Herman Ivory, Chairperson
Muskegon County Board of
Commissioners
Muskegon, Michigan

Mr. James E. Jacobs
Special Asst. for Legis. Affairs
Bureau of Employment & Training
Lansing, Michigan

Mr. Charles Kane, Exec. Asst.
Employment & Training Admin.
Region V Department of Labor
Chicago, Illinois

Dr. Charles Killingsworth
Professor of Economics
Michigan State University
Lansing, Michigan

Ms. Sander Levin
Attorney
Bloomfield, Michigan

Mr. Von D. Logan, Chief
Labor Market & Analysis Section
MESC
Detroit, Michigan

Ms. Maryann Mahaffey
Councilperson
Detroit, Michigan

Mr. Joseph M. Miller, Dean
Occupational Studies
Washtenaw Community College
Ann Arbor, Michigan

Mr. James Morgan
Professor of Economics
The University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan

Ms. Meri Lou Murray, Chairperson
Washtenaw County Board of
Commissioners
Ann Arbor, Michigan

Mr. Robert Pendleton, Deputy Dir.
Bureau of Employment & Training
State Department of Labor
Lansing, Michigan

The Honorable Albert H. Quie
Congressman/Minnesota
Washington, D.C.

Mr. Michael C. Rogers
Assistant to Administrator
City of Ann Arbor
Ann Arbor, Michigan

Mr. Paul Roy
Manpower Director
Muskegon Consortium
Muskegon, Michigan

Mr. James Saari, Director
Western Upper Peninsula Manpower
Consortium
Ironwood, Michigan

Dr. Gerald G. Somers
Professor of Economics
The University of Wisconsin
Madison, Wisconsin

Dr. J. William Wenrich, President
Canada College
Redwood City, California

FIGURE II-2: MLP Resource Consultants (Continued)
Field Supervisors

Mary Ballantine
Dennis Brieske
Robert Culver
Bruce Jacobs
John Martinoff
Edward T. McKenzie
Jim Olson
Susan Quattrociocchi
Michael Quinn

Harry L. Redds
Kurt Ries
Dennis Rome
Ivan Ryan
Gary Scholten
Craig Schreuder
Asma Tappert
Adrian VandenBosch

Prime Sponsor Directors

Frank Bigham
Paul Bigley
Dennis Brieske
Gordon Goyt
Thomas E. Hazlewood
Bruce Jacobs
Arthur Lewis

John Martinoff
Gerald Mazurek
Kurt Ries
Paul Roy
Gary Scholten
Craig Schreuder
Marion Stickle

FIGURE II-3: MLP Resource Associates

Software, in the form of leadership/manpower publications, was collected. The reference lists for each of the course syllabi were used as a basis for the collection. A list of the composite collection, shelved in the Media Center Library, School of Education, The University of Michigan, can be found in Appendix D.

Conference Design and Execution

Three state-wide Manpower Leadership Conferences were designed and executed. The design evolved from an advisory panel representative of CETA prime sponsor directors. Figure II-4 is a list of the advisory council.
Price Banks, Director, Livingston County Department of Internal Affairs
Allan Becker, Deputy Director, Manpower Department, City of Detroit
Paul Bigley, Director, Region II Manpower Consortium
Alden Briscoe, CETA Director, Flint, Genesee, Lapeer, Shiawasee Counties
Thomas Hazlewood, Director, Central Upper Peninsula Manpower Consortium
Robert Pendleton, Deputy Director, Bureau of Manpower, State Department of Labor
Paul Roy, Manpower Director, Muskegon Consortium

FIGURE II-4: MLP Conference Advisory Board Members

The initial conference was held in Ann Arbor, the second in Lansing, and the last in Detroit. Attendance spiraled from 50 to 125 to 250. Copies of the programs may be found in Appendix E. The Manpower Leadership Education Project Conference Series Evaluation Report may be found in Appendix F.

The conference execution was such that proceedings were warranted. Consequently, a separate publication was produced. This publication, entitled Employment and Training - A Michigan Overview, 1975-1976: Proceedings of a Conference Series, may be obtained through the Occupational Education Programs, School of Education, The University of Michigan.

Planning Manpower Leadership Education

Plans for continuation and/or expansion of manpower leadership education continued throughout 1975-1976. A substantive plan will take the form of a proposal to be submitted to the Michigan Department of Labor, Bureau of Manpower.
The planning effort evolved from three primary sources: MLEP staff, third-party evaluation, and the conference advisory committee. The MLEP staff, after due consideration to the other primary sources, developed various recommendations. These are reported in Chapter III. The 1976-1977 proposal will incorporate the recommendations.

The Conference Advisory Committee's recommendations are reported in Appendix G. The third-party evaluation planning contribution is presented in Appendix H.

1976-1977 Participant Identification and Recruitment

Contingent upon continuation of the project, and based upon positive feedback regarding the project, a 1976-1977 recruitment program was launched. Certain adjustments were made to the selection process. The adjustments are listed below:

1. Recruitment information was updated.
2. Various recruitment forms were refined.
3. Timetable for selection was moved forward.
4. Each prospective participant will have three interviews.
5. Each prospective participant will be asked to take the SCAT (School and College Ability Test).

The specific process used for 1976-1977 will be reported in the 1976-1977 final report.

Data supports that 43 persons were nominated, 38 submitted applications, 33 were interviewed, and 24 were invited to participate in the 1976-1977 Manpower Leadership Program.
This chapter has presented the products of the efforts to meet the 1975-1976 Manpower Leadership Education Project objectives. Information was presented within the chapter and through referral to the Appendices and other publications.
This chapter presents the evaluation system used during the first year of the MLEP and the resultant recommendations. Detailed support data may be found in Appendices F, G, and H. Naturally, this year's evaluation is of a short-term nature. The long-term efforts must await two to three years of service in the field by the participants.

Evaluation System

The project director and coordinator assumed judgmental responsibility for decision making. Input, of an informal and formal nature, was sought from the MLEP staff, MLP participants, conference advisory committee, conference participants, and local manpower personnel. All tangible data obtained were forwarded to a third-party evaluation team. The team was comprised of: Mr. Samuel Bernstein, Dr. Rupert Evans, and Dr. Gerald Somers. The third-party evaluation report may be found in Appendix H.

The evaluation data were collected consistent with the Content, Input, Process and Product (CIPP) model. This model is described as an adaptation of D. L. Stufflebeam's, by Tim L. Wentling and Tom E. Lawson in their book entitled: Evaluating Occupational Education and Training Programs, Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1975. The first three components of this model were applicable on a short-term basis.
The following tangible sources of evaluation data were collected:

1. Weekly staff briefings.
2. Anonymous course evaluations. (See Figure III-1 for a sample copy.)
3. Anonymous resource person evaluations. (See Figure III-2 for a sample copy.)
4. Composite evaluations by the group. (See Figure III-3 for a sample copy.)
5. Other evaluation per Appendices F, G, and H.

DIRECTIONS

Circle the number before the one phrase which best represents your choice. On the scale of 1-5, consider the midpoint as average. Reserve (1) for truly exceptional and (5) for its opposite extreme.

1. How would you rate your instructor in general (all-around) teaching effectiveness?
   1) An outstanding and stimulating instructor
   2) A very good instructor
   3) A good instructor
   4) A fair instructor
   5) A poor and inadequate instructor

2. How would you rate the overall value of this course?
   1) Superior
   2) Very good
   3) Good
   4) Fair
   5) Poor
3. How well does your instructor seem to know the subject?
   1) Thorough and profound scholarship
   2) Knowledge broad and accurate
   3) Adequate knowledge
   4) Occasional gaps in knowledge
   5) Inadequate knowledge

4. How clearly does your instructor present his subject?
   1) Exceedingly clear in presentation
   2) Very clear in presentation
   3) Clearly
   4) Not very clearly
   5) Not at all clear in presentation

5. How interesting does he make the material?
   1) Exceedingly interesting
   2) Very interesting
   3) Interesting
   4) Not very interesting
   5) The course is a bore

6. How objective do you consider your instructor?
   1) Encourages differences in viewpoint
   2) Permits expression of different points of view
   3) Usually tolerant
   4) Seldom permits expression of different points of view
   5) Intolerant, allows no contradiction

7. How much individual help do you feel you are able to get in this course?
   1) A great deal
   2) Quite a bit
   3) Some
   4) Little
   5) None

The remaining items are primarily descriptive of the manner of teaching and of the classroom situation. Respond as best you can to these aspects.

A. Is class time well spent?
   a) Very well spent
   b) About 50-50
   c) Poorly spent

B. How do you feel about the amount of outside work assigned?
   a) About right
   b) Too much
   c) Too little

FIGURE III-1: Student Report on Teaching (Continued)
C. How appropriate is the pace of presentation of the material?
   a) About right
   b) Too fast
   c) Too slow

D. How current is the course content?
   a) Up to date, relevant research and commentary presented
   b) So-so, some current research and comment
   c) The course needs to be brought up to date

E. How valuable are the text and other assigned readings?
   a) Exceedingly valuable
   b) Generally valuable
   c) A waste of time

F. Keeping in mind that the returns from this questionnaire will be used by the instructor in the process of improving his teaching, please mention below any other aspects of the course or instructor not covered in previous questions, which you consider to be especially good or poor, and offer any suggestions that you have for improvement of the course. If you wish, you may supplement or clarify your responses to questions 1-7 and A-E. Use additional paper if needed.
The University of Michigan
MANPOWER LEADERSHIP PROGRAM

SPEAKER EVALUATION FORM

Speaker's Name ____________________________

Date ____________________  Time ____________________

DIRECTIONS: Record your reaction to each criteria area by placing a number in the space provided using the following rating scale. An asterisk (*) indicates that the criterion may not be used.

RATING SCALE:

5 - excellent  4 - very good  3 - good
2 - fair       1 - poor

CRITERIA AREAS

1. Stimulated and maintained interest.
2. Adequate preparation and organization.
3. Delivery of presentation.
5. Opportunity for group interaction with speaker.
6. Relevance of subject and content for group.
7. Adequate coverage of topic.
8. Utilization of allotted time.

RECOMMENDATIONS: Circle correct response.

Yes  No  9. Should this topic be used next year?
Yes  No  10. Should this speaker be used next year?

COMMENTS:

FIGURE III-2: MLF Speaker Evaluation Form

36
MANPOWER LEADERSHIP PROGRAM
COMPOSITE EVALUATION

December 12, 1975

The following strengths, concerns, and suggestions evolved from a group session convened on Friday evening, December 12, 1975. Dan Vogler, facilitator of the evaluation session, noted that input was welcomed which would relate to Context or Input or Process (CIPP) evaluation system. The data would be utilized for decision-making related to the program.

The Manpower Leadership Program participants were advised that their comments were open-ended and should not be construed as representing consensus of the group. The participants were further advised that they should not fear recrimination for any comments made. The following data were provided and reported chronologically as it was offered.

Program Strengths

1. The content within the program relates closely to administrator weaknesses.

2. The instructors and resources are readily available.

3. The program is well-organized.

4. The support services (e.g.,) is appreciated.

5. The applicability of program towards credits and degree.

6. The flexibility for participant input.

7. The opportunity to meet and confer with other manpower practitioners.

8. The selection process utilized—not selecting elitists.

FIGURE III-3: MLP Composite Evaluation
9. The resource materials (ERIC) are worthwhile.

10. The opportunity for theory/practice blend.

11. The course materials are applicable to everyday problems.

12. The instructors are qualified.

Program Concerns

1. All students are not aware of the strengths of the program.

2. Perhaps it is too theory-oriented without "new" applicability.

3. Manpower and public education are not the same, although they are "kissing cousins."

4. Instructors are research-oriented and lack the "field experience."

5. Coordination and communication among the instructors.

6. All instructors were not aware of where participants were coming from.

7. Not enough lead time for assignments. The end of the term was overloaded.

8. Imbalance between P.S. and CBO's information focus.

9. Instructors sometimes act as though their class is "the only class."

10. Participant mixture created problems.


13. Employers are not sufficiently oriented about the program.

14. Course load is perhaps too high.

15. Too much work for credit granted.


17. Did not get assignment material returned for work on future assignment.

FIGURE III-3: MLP Composite Evaluation (Continued)
18. Requirements specified in syllabus and those expected did not always match.

19. Participants did not jell and thus, participants did not maximize each other as resources.

**Suggestions**

1. Provide better briefing for instructional courses at the beginning of each term.

2. Provide more time between intensive instructional blocks.

3. Strive toward naming and communicating to employers what a manpower leader is prepared to do.

4. The University of Michigan should sell the employer on the program.

5. Provide a newsletter to employers from manpower staff. Develop a manpower mailing list for participants.

6. Adjust the program to individual needs.

7. Each instructor should receive a list of the students' extern plans.

8. Participants background data should be provided to all Manpower Leadership Program staff.

9. Build accountability into staff and resource people.

10. Seek more involvement from field supervisors.

11. Field supervisors should be more extraneous to daily work.

12. Provide more direct feedback to students.

13. Assess each student's needs before entry into program.

14. Field supervisors should fill out the competency assessment of students.

The input was recorded on the chalk board. The group was polled for consensus on each input. The consensus did not evolve on all input. The process revealed that the inputs were individualized and another procedure should be used to determine the extent of agreement.
Recommendations

Following are the recommendations which evolved from the system identified heretofore. The recommendations are listed in their approximate chronological occurrence. No relative importance is implied through this listing.

1. Move the MLP recruitment timetable forward by at least one week.

2. Develop a supervisor/participant/U of M representative work session to develop extern plans.

3. Investigate the feasibility of regular communication to manpower personnel within the state. A newsletter or regular input to an existing publication might be appropriate.

4. Strengthen communication of program intent and commitment required to the program during the selection process.

5. Collect and process university applications as a group. The MLEP director or coordinator should assume responsibility for monitoring application submission.

6. Request and reserve housing for participants in one location for the entire program.

7. Reduce the on-site extern visits to one or two per term.

8. Utilize telephone conference calls as an alternative to on-site visitations.

9. Reduce the mini-seminars to one per term.

10. Shift major responsibility for content questions during mini-seminars to participants.

11. Stress the importance of time lines and punctuality.

12. Organize maxi-seminars to maximize the uncommitted evening time.

13. Identify and develop a communication system which will facilitate participant pressure relief. This is very crucial about one month before terms are concluded.
14. Submit textbook orders by mid-July and early October for Fall Term and Winter Term respectively.

15. Strive for more objective procedures for the translation of extern experiences to grades. A pass/fail approach and/or self-assessments were suggested.

16. Develop staff articulation sessions to promote an interface and continuity among courses.

17. Develop a composite profile of participants which can be disseminated among instructors and participants.

18. Request each student to design a one page manpower resume for duplication and dissemination among participants.

19. Develop content and process oriented learning experiences toward the political aspects of manpower.

20. Administer the SCAT (School and College Ability Test) for the purpose of identifying potential participant problems in math and communication skills.

21. Refer participants with potential math or communication problems to appropriate university services.

22. Solicit nominations through prime sponsor or sub-prime sponsor directors.

23. Refine and revise selection forms to reflect contemporary conditions relative to sex, age, and race affirmative practices.

24. Encourage participants to set priorities and work within realistic educational timelines.


26. Alter procedures within the extern program.

27. Replicate the MLP component with incorporation of recommendations listed herein.

28. Offer at least two state-wide conferences similar to 1975-76 format.

29. Design and implement three weekend workshops. The target groups should include representation of elected officials, senior CETA representatives, and representatives of CETA advisory groups. The focus of the workshops should be leadership oriented with emphasis on roles and responsibilities.
APPENDIX A

MANPOWER LEADERSHIP COMPETENCIES
ECONOMICS COMPETENCIES

Obtain unemployment information.

Obtain low income information.

Identify area unemployment.

Define/identify underemployed individuals.

Describe client population.

Identify labor market disabilities.

Define/identify economically disadvantaged individuals.

Identify area low-income adults.

Interpret socio-economic data.

Interpret statistical data.

Interpret demographic data.

Identify economic relationships.

Develop local manpower survey.

Analyze local labor market.

Analyze survey results.

Analyze data/problem connections.

Analyze manpower needs.

Utilize manpower survey resources.

Identify prime sponsors' manpower needs.

Survey manpower needs.

Develop comprehensive labor market information system.

Evaluate "drop-out" factors (mandatory and voluntary).

Relate education/income.

Identify program cost effectiveness.

Identify research needs.
ADMINISTRATION COMPETENCIES

Outline bureaucratic organizational structure.

Outline union organization.

Define organizational structure of prime sponsors.

Define prime sponsors' management functions.

Define prime sponsors' planning functions.

Design financial management system.

Determine prime sponsors' staff requirements.

Define prime sponsors' evaluation functions.

Evaluate employee performance.

Use merit system techniques.

Manage organizational conflict.

Design information management system.

Design prime sponsor organizational structure.

Design program planning and budget system.

Prepare budget.

Analyze budget.
SOCIAL WORK COMPETENCIES

Analyze community resources.
Identify "technologies" of service agencies.
Identify "product" of service agencies.
Identify legal services.
Identify medical services.
Identify prime sponsors' educational resources.
Identify housing services.
Identify transportation services.
Identify social services, welfare, child care, etc.
Identify community educational resources.
Identify non-CETA services.
Identify situational agency barriers.
Identify environmental agency barriers.
Identify artificial employment barriers.
Identify organizational agency barriers.
Accept characteristics and personality traits of ethnic and/or minority groups.

Describe discrimination effects.
Describe minority business developments.
Perceive poor person problems.
Describe client service options.
Identify client's public identity.
Develop positive client labels.
Determine client participation barriers.
Identify client's social situation.
Identify client target group.
Promote "societal" relationship.
Devise cooperation strategies.
Develop community linkage.
Analyze intra-agency conflict.
Analyze inter-group relations.
Analyze inter-agency conflict.
Identify community opinion leaders.
Analyze community power structure.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identify target group needs.</th>
<th>Assess client's aptitude.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identify client's service needs.</td>
<td>Assess vocational interests/aptitudes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify client's testing needs.</td>
<td>Assess client's employability needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify client's counseling needs.</td>
<td>Provide on-going client assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify client's child care needs.</td>
<td>Identify client's needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify client's transportation needs.</td>
<td>Recognize client's human needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify client's attributes.</td>
<td>Establish client priorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify client's problems.</td>
<td>Expand client's background information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview potential clients.</td>
<td>Analyze client problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview client.</td>
<td>Counsel potential clients.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use listening skills.</td>
<td>Participate in &quot;helping&quot; team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test potential clients.</td>
<td>Provide group counseling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assess client's basic educational skills.</td>
<td>Analyze group process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assess client's interests.</td>
<td>Deliver client serviceB.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determine client's occupational interests.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIRST SEMINAR COMPETENCIES

Identify manpower jargon.
Describe historical development of manpower legislation.
Describe MDTA legislation.
Describe EOA legislation.
Explain manpower/union relationship.
Review manpower legislation.
Review prime sponsor activities.
Describe recruitment functions.
Describe placement functions.
Discuss prime sponsor role.
Describe inter-prime sponsor area.
Describe intra-prime sponsor area.
Describe statewide prime sponsor area.
Identify state official.
Describe role of State Advisory Council for Vocational Education.
Describe role of State Advisory Council for Adult & Continuing Education.
Describe CETA/Vocational Education funding.
Interpret governmental guidelines.
Determine Section 112 funding levels.
Use CETA funding formula.
Identify CETA funding resources.
Outline participant flow system.
Diagram client routing patterns.
Observe client routing patterns.
Identify "qualified" applicants.
Diagnose eligibility requirements.
Determine program selection priorities.
Determine program eligibility requirements.
Describe occupational preparation steps.
Describe teaching-learning strategies.
Describe components of curriculum development.
Plan training program.
Use problem solving process.
Develop target job requirements.
SECOND SEMINAR COMPETENCIES

Interpret manpower financial report.
Estimate service costs.
Assign activity costs.
Develop budget.
Evaluate manpower programs.
Develop quantitative evaluation measures.
Develop program evaluation tools.
Assess current program effectiveness.
Assess current program efforts.
Describe instructional evaluation techniques.
Evaluate employer's program attitude.
Assess new project effectiveness.
Evaluate manpower services delivery system.
Develop client follow-up procedures.
Evaluate client routing patterns.
Analyze self.
Write Manpower Services Council Guide.
Outline management-by-objectives (MBO) system.
Write performance standards.
Write work statements.
Write program standard.
Write selection priorities.
Design manpower services delivery system.
Design demonstration programs.
Design experimental program.
Design client orientation services.
Design counseling services.
Design intake procedures.
Design CETA implementation strategy.
Design referral system.
Design job counseling programs.
Design assessment system.
Review prime sponsor area.
Develop comprehensive manpower plan.
Use the Dictionary of Occupational Titles (D.O.T.)

Determine occupational requirements.

Compute occupation skill level (4+5+6 digits in D.O.T.)

Interpret occupational skill level.

Establish wage standards.

Establish employment outcomes.

Describe occupational clusters.

Describe career ladders and lattices.

Describe job classification systems.

Identify salary characteristics of occupation.

Use job restructuring techniques.

Write job descriptions.

Identify job cognitive skills.

Identify job psychomotor skills.

Identify affective skills of job.

Perform occupational analysis.

Write goal statement.

Develop performance objectives.

Outline training program establishments.

Develop institutional training plans.

Develop subsidized work experience options.

Develop transitional public service employment options.

Write O-J-T contracts (subsidizes, first hire).

Develop "non-financial agreement."

Develop training agreements.

Design delivery system.

Examine area manpower policy issues.
EXTERNSHIP COMPETENCIES

Utilize existing educational resources.
Operate area manpower research.
Execute work and training policy.
Execute discrimination policy.
Execute political activity policy.
Execute criminal provision policy.
Maintain Labor Department Relations.
Operate Job Corps Program.
Conduct manpower demonstration program.
Operate manpower service.
Operate public employment program.
Operate manpower program.
Manage manpower program.
Coordinate Regional Training Programs.
Develop required reports.
Submit grant application.
Prepare grant application.
Establish comprehensive manpower services.

Develop CETA consortia.
Establish Manpower Council.
Request on-site technical assistance.
Recruit client jobs.
Develop client job.
Restructure client job.
Apply CETA priorities.
Coordinate two prime sponsor area educational resources.
Apply CETA policies.
Coordinate prime sponsor educational resources.
Process client information.
Process program impact information.
Use intra-agency communication techniques.
Schedule staff development opportunities.
Maintain records.
Write news releases.
Provide consultation.
Chair committee meeting.
Lead small group discussion.
Apply affirmative action regulations.
Supervise employees.
Disseminate program information.
Regulate client flow.
Advertise program options.
Set service priorities.
Implement client employment plan.
Develop client employment plan.
Select service operators.
Select coordinating methods.
Match client priority groups with priority employment.
Develop assessment services.
Develop intake services.
Develop outreach/recruitment services.
Use CETA guides.
Use referral sources; e.g., schools, social welfare offices, employment service, parole boards, probation offices, churches, service clubs, others).
Use job development techniques.
Use job creation techniques.
Use job solicitation techniques.
Use job placement techniques.
Use job retention techniques.
Determine prime sponsor program operators.
Coordinate employment services.
Coordinate subsidized employment.
Coordinate client "appeal" services.
Coordinate vocational education services.
Coordinate client basic education.
Coordinate client counseling.
Coordinate client testing.
Coordinate client coaching.
Coordinate classroom training.
Coordinate CETA orientation.
Coordinate transitional public employment.
Coordinate client O-J-T.
Coordinate intake.
Coordinate staff outreach effort.
Coordinate support services.
Recommend program improvements.
Recommend priority occupational training areas.
Plan inservice training programs.
OTHER COMPETENCIES

Validate learning devices.
Identify public vocational education services.
Describe MDE structure.
Identify private vocational education services.
Describe MDE manpower policies.

Describe supplemental vocational education training.
Describe supplemental vocational education services.
Provide vocational supplemental training.
Identify relationships with other delivery systems.
APPENDIX B

COURSE SYLLABI

53
LABOR MARKET INFORMATION

3 Credit Hours

Developed by Malcolm S. Cohen

Course Focus

The course examines sources, uses, strengths and limitations of labor market information which prime sponsors must use to develop, evaluate and monitor their plans of service. A conceptual background is presented for each topic area so that data uses can be better understood. The conceptual framework is from an economics perspective.

Course Content

1. See Addendum A for course content.
2. See Addendum B for specific competencies.
3. See Addendum C for references.

Reference Material

No required text. Students will utilize books and periodicals from the library. Books will be recommended for purchase but their purchase is not required. Students will receive several handouts.

Course Procedures

1. Lectures tie conceptual framework of topic areas to data uses.
2. Students will have an opportunity to use the computer terminal to access data about their own local area.
3. Students will work through practical problems such as forecasting employment in their own area using a computer based simulation program.
4. Students will write a paper on one of the ten topics. Students will use additional reference material listed in Addendum C for paper.

Evaluation

Students will be graded on problems and exercises. Students will not be graded on what they remember about specific data sources but on how well they can apply what they learn to hypothetical work situations. Students are expected to satisfactorily complete all exercises and paper to earn a passing grade. The course will be graded as pass-fail. There will be no examinations. Students having difficulty completing an assignment will have plenty of opportunity to interact with the instructor.
SESSION           TOPIC

I. Unemployment
   A. Causes of unemployment
   B. Patterns of worker job search
   C. Employment problems of special groups
   D. Measures of unemployment
      1. Census Bureau/Bureau of Labor statistics labor force concepts
      2. Workforce estimates
      3. Insured unemployed
      4. Discouraged workers
      5. Underemployed workers
      6. Other measures

II. Programs to Deal with Unemployment
   A. U.S. Employment Service
      1. Traditional role
      2. Computerized services
   B. Public service employment
   C. Private employers
   D. Other programs

III. Demand for Labor
    A. Factors affecting demand for labor
    B. Employer search for labor
    C. Strategies for employer contact
    D. Measures of labor demand

IV. Labor Supply
    A. Factors affecting supply of labor
    B. Supply by occupation
    C. Measures of supply
    D. Labor mobility

V. Forecasting
    A. General economic conditions
    B. Labor force and employment
    C. Occupational trends
VI. Poverty and Human Capital
   A. Causes of poverty
      1. Handicaps
      2. Low paying jobs
      3. Unemployment
      4. Old age
      5. Inadequate training
   B. Human capital
   C. Measures of target groups
   D. Use of computer to determine target groups

VII. Simulation
   A. Exercise in building a model of local labor market
   B. Making assumptions about future labor market conditions
   C. Evaluating results of simulations

VIII. Cost Benefit Analysis
   A. Measuring costs
   B. Measuring benefits
   C. Comparing costs to benefits
   D. Some common pitfalls
   E. Applications to manpower programs

IX. Survey Methods
   A. Estimating survey costs
   B. Drawing the sample
   C. Designing the questionnaire
   D. Pretesting the questionnaire
   E. Carrying out the survey
   F. Analysis of survey results
   G. Evaluating survey accuracy

X. Designing a local information system
   A. Determining the need for an information system
   B. Defining information requirements
   C. Identifying information gaps
   D. Choosing a delivery system
PRE-SESSION LEARNING ACTIVITIES
See Addendum C for Readings
Handouts will also be prepared for distribution

SPECIAL IN CLASS/AFTER CLASS LEARNING ACTIVITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SESSION</th>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>RESOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Construct estimates of unemployment for 1974 and 1975 for prime sponsor area</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Be prepared to discuss ways unemployment can be reduced in your area</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Examine hypothetical data to determine strategy for employer contact</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Measure labor supply</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Evaluate forecasts</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Access data on target groups</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>Simulate labor market supply and demand</td>
<td>Computer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>Carry out cost benefit analysis of hypothetical manpower program</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
<td>Guest lecturer</td>
<td>Institute of Survey Research, Guest Lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Design a local information system</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ADDENDUM B

SPECIFIC COMPETENCIES

1. Identify causes of unemployment
2. Obtain unemployment information
3. Analyze programs to aid unemployed
4. Develop strategy to contact area employers
5. Measure local area demand for labor
6. Measure local supply of labor
7. Analyze labor mobility and commuting
8. Obtain forecasts of labor force and employment
    Obtain occupational forecasts
9. Analyze causes of poverty
10. Identify target groups for manpower programs
11. Use computer for labor market analysis
12. Measure costs and benefits of manpower programs
13. Carry out local manpower survey
14. Design a labor market information system
Students have different backgrounds and interests. Readings indicated by an (*) are basic readings that all students should read. Other readings are suggested for students that want to explore the topic in greater depth. References are arranged by session. Readings indicated by an (**) are recommended for purchase.
I. Unemployment

A. Causes of Unemployment


B. Patterns of Worker Job Search


Holt, Charles, et. al., Manpower Programs to Reduce Inflation and Unemployment: Manpower Lyrics for Macro Music, (Washington: The Urban Institute, 1971)


C. Employment Problems of Special Groups

Bain, Trevor, Labor Market Experience of Engineers During Periods of Changing Demand, Manpower Research Monograph No. 35, (Washington: G.P.O.,
C. Employment Problems of Special Groups (Cont.)


D. Measures of Unemployment


*U.S. Manpower Administration, Area Trends, selected issues, skim.
D. Measures of Unemployment (Cont.)

U.S. Manpower Administration, Manpower Report of the President, 1975, skim.


II. Programs to Deal with Unemployment


Gordon, Margaret S. and Margaret Thal-Larsen, Employer Policies in a Changing Labor Market, Institute of Industrial Relations, University of California, Berkeley, July, 1969.


* Johnson, Miriam, Counter Point the Changing Employment Service, Salt Lake City: Olympus Publishing Co.


B. Public Service Employment


B. Public Service Employment (Cont.)


C. Screening and Licensing


Miller, Herbert S., The Closed Door, Institute of Criminal Law and Procedure, Georgetown University Law Center, report to the Manpower Administration, 1972.


D. Other Programs


III. Demand for Labor

A. Factors Affecting Demand for Labor


A. Factors Affecting Demand for Labor (Cont.)


B. Employer Planning, Promotions and Upgrading


New Careers Systems Institute, Development and Study of Upgrade Models in Private Industry: Four Case Studies, report to the Manpower Administration.

Oak Ridge Associated Universities, Upgrading in an Industrial Setting, report to the U.S. Department of Labor.


C. Strategies for Employer Contact


Guidelines for Installing and Maintaining an Effective Employer Services Program Locally, National Technical Information Service PB 220166.

D. Measures of Labor Demand

D. Measures of Labor Demand (Cont.)

**Moser, C., Manpower Planning for Jobs in Rural America, proceedings of a conference sponsored by the Center for Rural Manpower and Public Affairs, December, 1972.**

**Moser, Collette, (ed.), Labor Market Information in a Rural Area, Center for Rural Manpower and Public Affairs, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan, February, 1972.**


IV. Labor Supply

A. Factors Affecting Labor Supply


A. Factors Affecting Labor Supply (Cont.)


B. Supply of Special Occupation Groups


C. Measures of Supply


**Moser, C., Labor Market Information in Rural Areas, proceedings of a conference sponsored by the Center for Rural Manpower and Public Affairs, Michigan State University, 1972.


D. Labor Mobility


Mangum, Garth L., Relocation Assistance Under the New Manpower Legislation, Human Resources Institute, University of Utah, report to the Manpower Administration, 1974.


TenPas, Cilla Reesman, Answering the Mobility Imporative, Northern Michigan University Skill Center, Marquette, Michigan, February, 1974.

V. Forecasting

*American Statistical Association, proceedings of the Social Statistics Section, 1974, Session I "Manpower Forecasting".
V. Forecasting (Cont.)


**Blaug, M., Economics of Education 1, Penguin paperback, Part 4.


VI. Poverty and Human Capital

A. Causes of Poverty


*Blaustone, Murphy and Stevenson, Low Wages and the Working Poor, Ann Arbor: Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations, 1974.


B. Human Capital


B. Human Capital (Cont.)

**Blaug, M., Economics of Education 1, Penguin paperback, Part 1.


C. Measures of Target Groups


D. Use of Computer to Determine Target Groups

* Special Handout.

VII. Simulation


* Special Handout.

VIII. Cost Benefit Analysis

**Blaug, M., Economics of Education 1, Penguin paperback, Part 3.


VIII. Cost Benefit Analysis (Cont.)


IX. Survey Methods


X. Designing An Information System


Levine, Louis, Labor Market Information for the Local Delivery of Manpower Services (Washington, 1972)

Mangum, Garth and David Snedeker, "The Realities of Manpower Planning," Manpower, August, 1974 pp. 3-7.

** Moser, Collette, Labor Market Information in Rural Areas, Michigan State University, 1972

Sawyer, James, "Lessons for Prime Sponsors," Manpower April, 1974
X. Designing An Information System (con't)

Thal-Larsen, Margaret, Requirements and Design of a Labor Market Information System for a Large Metropolitan Area, U.S. Department of Commerce, National Technical Information Service, PB213744, 1973


* Yawitz, Buris III, Morse, Dean W., The Labor Market Information System, New York: Praeger, 1973
A. COURSE FOCUS

This course will expose learners to selected portions of the relevant professional literature in organizational, administrative, and leadership theory. Within the general context of the issues, problems and opportunities which reside in the area of manpower utilization and development the course will provide the opportunity for learners to integrate more theoretical knowledge with their own professional and practical experiences. Special attention will be given to relating knowledge and skills to the person's current work place.

B. COURSE CONTENT

Please refer to Addendum A.

C. REFERENCE MATERIALS

No textbook will be required for this course. The instructor will provide carefully selected journal articles at appropriate points in the course. In those cases when generic books and articles are not available for class distribution, learners will have access to them at the reserve desk of the Graduate Library. The instructor will also make periodic suggestions regarding materials an individual learner may wish to purchase for his/her own personal library.

Please refer to Addendum B for a general reference list for this course.

D. COURSE PROCEDURES

Please refer to Addendum C for a statement of course procedures, expectations and a projected class schedule.

E. EVALUATION

Please refer to Addendum D for an outline of the evaluative criteria to be applied for this course.
ADDENDUM A

Outline of Course Content

AREA I - Theories of Organization

Learners will review a representative spectrum of the several theories of organization with special attention to:

A. Formal and Informal Structures
B. Various Formal and Informal Communications Networks and Patterns in Organizations
C. Organizational and Group Cohesiveness
D. Organizational Norms vs. Personal and Interpersonal Goals
E. Planned Organizational and Group Change
   1. From the organization's perspective
   2. From the learner's perspective

Specific Competencies

1. Learners will be able to analyze, assess, and diagnose groups and organizations providing (where needed) prescriptive strategies for indicated change.

2. Learners will be able to apply knowledge and skills to their own work setting.

3. Learners will be able to generalize learnings to other work places with which they have no current involvement.

AREA II - Theories of Administration

Learners will examine several selected theories of administrative practice in light of their knowledge and understanding of groups and organizations. Special attention will be given to the following areas as they relate to administrative practice:

A. Differences Between Administrative, Management and Leadership Functions
B. The Role of Planning in Administration and Leadership
AREA II (continued)

C. Financial Management in Administration and Leadership
D. Personnel Functions in Administration

1. Staffing Requirements
2. Employee Evaluation

E. Staff Development and Training Roles of Administrators
and Organizational Leaders

Specific Competencies

1. Learners will be able to distinguish between administrative and management functions in terms of their own workplace, group, and organization.

2. Learners will be able to engage in short, medium, and long-term planning within the context of their own organizational situation.

3. Learners will be able to use one or more financial management systems which are congruent with the planning approach taken in #2 above.

4. Learners will be able to assess and evaluate the staffing requirements for their own organization, as well as assess and critique the employee evaluation procedures currently practiced there.

5. Learners will be able to design ongoing staff development and training systems which will relate directly to #2, #3, and #4, above.

AREA III - Theories of Leadership

Learners will review selected representative theories of leadership within the context of their understandings of organizational issues and administrative practice. Particular attention will be devoted to:

A. Further Distinction Between Leadership, Management, and Administration

B. A Selected Range of Leadership Styles

C. Criteria Which Help Determine Appropriate Leadership Style for the Individual, Organization, and Tasks of the Organization
Specific Competencies

1. Learners will be able to draw the distinction between leadership, management, and administration in the context of their own experience and current work place.

2. Learners will be aware of the breadth of leadership styles, as well as the differences among them.

3. Learners will be aware of the leadership style which they most often exhibit.

4. Learners will be more aware of the reasons for their own leadership style.

5. Learners will be able to use a set of criteria which will assist them in selecting an appropriate and productive leadership style in situations with which they have contact.
Reference List


NOTE: These materials are provided as a general resource for course members. Selected journal articles will be distributed to learners during the class sessions. Additional materials will be placed at the Reserve Desk of the Graduate Library under the title: Education B650.
ADDENDUM C

Course Procedures

As indicated above, this course seeks to promote the integration of theoretical and conceptual knowledge on the one hand with professional and practical experience on the other. In addition to highly interactive in-class sessions involving learners in discussion, ample opportunity will be provided for skill practice as it relates to the focus of discussion.

Furthermore, learners will be expected to provide the following assignments in writing:

1. A two-dimensional diagram of their "back home" organization's formal and informal structure (Area I).

2. A two-dimensional diagram of their "back home" organization's formal and informal communications network with an evaluation of each (Area I).

3. A medium range plan for their "back home" organization in the area of their most immediate responsibility (Area II).

4. A plan for a staff development and training program appropriate to their "back home" organization consistent with competencies #2, #3, and #4 (Area II).

5. A self-assessment of their own leadership style (Area III).

6. A statement of the conditions and circumstances within themselves, others, and the organization which promote or suggest this leadership style (Area III).

Alongside these specific assignments, learners will be expected to keep pace in the reading of distributed journal articles and reserved publications as indicated by the instructor. In order to provide both learner and instructor feedback, a one-hour examination will be administered at the end of the first intensive week of course work (January 24, 1976).

Projected Course Schedule

Each class session will be three hours in duration. The intensive course experience will consist of two one-week periods as indicated below.
January 20th:
Introduction to Course
Formal and Informal Structure

Assignment: Diagram of "back home" organization's formal and informal structure.

January 21st:
Formal and Informal Communications
Networks
Organizational and Group Cohesiveness

Assignment: Diagram of "back home" organization's formal and informal communications network

January 22nd:
Organizational Norms vs. Personal and Interpersonal Goals

January 23rd:
Planned Organizational Change

Resource Person: Professor Kornbluh

January 24th:
Planned Organizational Change
One-Hour Examination

February 17th:
Differences Between Administrative and Management Functions
The Role of Planning - Administration and Leadership

Assignment: A medium range plan for "back home" organization in the area of learners' primary responsibility.

February 18th:
Financial Management in Administration and Leadership
Personnel Functions in Administration and Leadership

Resource Person: Professor Bertolaet

February 19th:
Staff Development and Training
Roles of Administrators and Organizational Leaders

Assignment: A plan for a staff development and training program appropriate to learners' "back home" organization.

February 20th:
Further Distinctions Between Leadership, Management, and Administration
February 20th:

Further Distinctions Between Leadership, Management, and Administration
A Selected Range of Leadership Styles

Assignment:
Self-assessment of learner's own leadership style.

A statement of the conditions and circumstances within themselves, others, and the organization which promote or suggest this leadership style.

February 21st:
(Final Session)

Criteria Which Help Determine Appropriate Leadership Style for Individual, Organization, and Tasks of the Organization

Summary Recapitulation of Course Content
ADDENDUM D

Evaluation

Expectations of learners are indicated in Addendum C. The one-hour examination to be administered on January 24, 1976, will be evaluated through use of the letter grade of "A", "B", "C", "D", and "E". The instructor will also provide written feedback regarding examination responses.

The one-hour examination grade will determine one-fourth of the course grade.

The six written assignments indicated in Addendum C will also be evaluated through use of letter grades.

Each written assignment grade will determine one-eighth of the course grade.

This system of "weighting" the examination and written assignment reflects the emphasis upon professional and practical application of knowledge and skills. Fully three-fourths of an individual's course grade will be determined by the grades in the written assignments. These assignments call for persons to make direct application of their knowledge and skills to "real life settings."
HUMAN RESOURCES PROGRAMS
(2 Credit Hours)

Developed by Louis A. Ferman

Course Focus

The course examines the range of human service agency alternatives available as a response to economic disadvantage. The course is examined from two perspectives: the needs of the client and the agency organization of the program to serve the client. The conceptual framework is from a social work and human service perspective.

Course Content

1. See Addendum A for course content.
2. See Addendum B for specific competencies.
3. See Addendum C for references.

Course Procedures

1. Lectures will tie conceptual and theoretical frameworks to research topic areas.
2. Students will work through a series of practical problems (such as client processing) in their own agency setting.
3. Students will write two brief papers on two of fifteen topics. Students will use additional reference material listed in Addendum C for paper.

Evaluation

Students will be graded on problems and exercises. Some weighting will be given to classroom participation. The major emphasis in grading will be on the student's ability to apply the course materials to concrete situations. Students are expected to satisfactorily complete all exercises and papers to earn a passing grade. The course will be graded as pass-fail. There will be no examinations. Students having difficulty completing assignments will have an opportunity to interact with the instructor.
## ADDENDUM A

### INSTRUCTIONAL CONTENT TOPICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SESSION</th>
<th>TOPIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I.</strong></td>
<td>The American Experience in Manpower Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A. Legislative history of manpower development for the hard-to-employ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Social and economic trends and their influence on human resource utilization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. Social, psychological and cultural barriers to full employment of the hard-to-employ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. The nature of the problem(s).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. New perspectives on manpower.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. new philosophies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. new concepts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. new programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Humanistic and economic reference points in analyzing the Manpower Revolution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. The manpower program and agency as problem solving tools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>II.</strong></td>
<td>Who Are the Hard-to-Employ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A. A typology of the hard-to-employ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Life styles of the hard-to-employ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Problem profiles of the hard-to-employ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Value systems of the hard-to-employ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>III.</strong></td>
<td>Programs and Strategies for Improving the Labor Market and Economic Circumstances of the Hard-to-Employ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A. Equal Opportunity Legislation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Income maintenance programs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. Planning, policy development and program implementation.

D. Management of inter-organizational exchanges and external relations.

V. Manpower Agency Operations: The Prerequisites

A. The interdependence of technology, structure, skills, intervention strategy and funding.

B. The labelling phenomenon
   1. Impact on agency-client relationship

C. The routing phenomenon
   1. Understanding agency operations and strategy through routing data.

D. A typology of intervention strategies for manpower agency operations.
   1. Psychological strategies
   2. Organizational strategies
   3. Interorganizational strategies
   4. Community strategies

VI. Manpower Agency Operations: The Manpower Subsystems and the Delivery of Manpower Services.

A. Preplacement
   1. Outreach
   2. Intake
   3. Prevocational training
   4. Technical training
   5. Counseling
SESSION

TOPIC

B. Placement
1. Counseling
2. Job analysis and description
3. Job vacancy determination
4. Job matching
5. Job placement, job development and job creation

C. Post Placement
1. Coaching
2. Other supportive services for the client
3. Follow-up services
4. Supportive services for company personnel
   a. executives
   b. middle management
   c. line supervisors
   d. Operational workers
5. Interagency relations

VII. The Agency Manpower Maze
A. The processing and labeling of clients.
B. Information processing and decision-making.

VIII. Evaluating Manpower Operations.
A. Systems of evaluation
B. The social context of evaluation
C. The measurement process and evaluation procedures
SESSION | TOPIC
---|---
IX. | The Dimensions of a Locally-Based, Comprehensive Manpower System.

A. The inventory of community resources.
B. Integrating social services and service delivery systems.
C. The political context.

X. | Review and Integration of Course Materials
A. Individual student reports.
ADDENDUM B

SPECIFIC COMPETENCIES

1. Identify major pieces of manpower legislation.
2. Identify client target groups of manpower agencies.
3. Analyze causes of job disadvantagement.
4. Identify artificial employment barriers.
5. Identify major systems of supportive services.
6. Identify intervention strategies and technologies of service agencies.
7. Identify organizational agency barriers.
8. Analyze administration and operation of a manpower agency.
9. Develop positive client labels.
10. Analyze intra-agency relationships.
11. Identify major agency manpower subsystems.
12. Analyze inter-agency conflict
13. Analyze and evaluate manpower service programs.
Students have different backgrounds and interests. Readings indicated by an (*) are basic readings that all students should read. Other readings are suggested for students that want to explore the topic in greater depth. References are arranged by section. Readings indicated by an (**) are recommended for purchase.
I. The American Experience in Manpower Policy

A. Legislative History of Manpower Programs.


B. Social and Economic Trends


Manpower Report to the President, (Copies on reserve at the Circulation Desk of the School of Social Work Library).

1969--Introduction, Chapters I, II and IV.

1971--Introduction, Chapters I, II and III.

1973--Introduction, Chapters I and II.

1975--Introduction, Chapters I and II.
C. Social, psychological and cultural barriers


D. The Manpower Revolution of the 1960's


II. Who Are the Hard-to-Employ


III. Programs and Strategies to Combat Economic Disadvantage

A. Equal Opportunity Legislation


IV. Administration and Operation of the Manpower Agency

A. The Manpower Agency: Structure and Function


B. Administrative Organization


C. and D. Program implementation and interorganizational relations


V. Manpower Agency Operations: Technology and Structure


Thompson, J. D., Organizations in Action, op. cit., Chapter 2.


VI. Manpower Agency Operations: The Manpower Subsystems


VII. The Agency Manpower Maze


Vinter, Robert, et.al., Information and Decision Processes in Human Service Organizations, (Final Report to the Office of Economic Opportunity, 1971), Chapters VI, VII, VIII and IX.

VIII. Evaluating Manpower Programs


IX. Dimensions of Locally-Based Manpower Systems

Ferman, Louis A., "The 'Full Service' Manpower Agency", 1971, (unpublished paper; to be distributed).

COURSE FOCUS

This course is designed to facilitate the development of skills which will enable the learners to translate current theories of career development into viable career guidance programs. Broad goals of the course include: (1) knowledge of career development theories; (2) ability to translate those theories into specific program goals based on client needs; (3) ability to design a career guidance program to meet these goals using a variety of guidance strategies; and (4) ability to implement, evaluate and renew the career guidance program. Special emphasis will be given to providing information relevant to the older youth and adult population and to a variety of organizational settings. The final outcome of the course is an increase in the learners' ability to design and implement career guidance programs for their current work setting.

B. COURSE CONTENT

Please refer to Addendum A.

C. REFERENCE MATERIALS

There will be three major required resources for this course. First, each learner will be required to purchase the Houghton Mifflin Guidance Monograph Series IV: Career Information and Development edited by Shelly Stone and Bruce Shertzer. This set consists of eight monographs including:

"Theories of Occupational Choice and Vocational Development" - Zaccaria
"Psychological Influences on Vocational Development" - Zytowski
"Students' Vocational Choices: A Review and Critique" - Brown
"College Information and Guidance" - Barre
"Occupational Information and Guidance" - Sinick
"The Theory/Practice of Communicating Educational and Occupational Information" - Martin
"Decision-Making and Vocational Development" - Herr
"Innovations in the Use of Career Information" - Chick
"Influence of Sociological Factors Upon Vocational Development" - Bain

Several of these monographs will form the basic required readings for the course. The total collection will provide a major reference library for the learners after the course is completed.
C. REFERENCE MATERIALS - Con't

A second required resource will be two interest inventories: the Self Directed Search and the Ohio Interest Inventory.

The final required resource for the course is the ERIC System. Each learner will identify program resources by using this system. Arrangements have been made to allow the learner to utilize the ERIC materials in the ERIC Counseling and Personnel Services Information Center located in the School of Education.

Please refer to Addendum B for a general reference list for this course.

D. COURSE PROCEDURES

Please refer Addendum C.

E. EVALUATION

Please refer to Addendum D.
ADDENDUM A

COURSE CONTENT

Area I - Career Development Theories

This area will focus on the introduction of career development theories, in depth study of several of these theories and the application of these theories to a self-study of the learner's own career development.

Specific learner competencies include:

A. Learner will know the career development theories of Super, Tiedeman, Roe and Holland.

B. Learner will understand personal and social factors which influence career development.

C. Learner will be able to define such terms as interests, abilities, achievement, work values, life style, career patterns, career role models, and career development stages.

D. Learner will be able to analyse his/her own career development in light of career development theories.

Area II - Career Guidance Program Development: Goal Setting

This area will help learners develop competencies in developing career guidance program goals and objectives. Major concepts presented will include needs assessment techniques and use of needs assessment data to develop program goals and objectives.

Specific learner competencies include:

A. Learner will understand various needs assessment techniques including surveys, interviews, standardized tests, and needs ranking procedures.

B. Learner will develop a needs assessment procedure for his/her own work setting.

C. Learner will conduct a needs assessment in his/her own work setting.

D. Learner will interpret the data from his/her needs assessment and translate these data into career guidance program goals.

E. Learner will identify objectives for each of the selected program goals.
Area III - Career Guidance Program Development: Designing Career Guidance Programs

This area will help learners design a career guidance program to facilitate the clients' obtainment of program goals. Major concepts presented include the introduction of major guidance strategies such as counseling, assessment and testing, occupational information systems, career information resources, decision-making training, and other new guidance techniques. Also, the area will stress the use of the ERIC System to identify guidance strategies and criteria for selecting guidance strategies for specific guidance programs.

Specific learner competencies include:

A. Learner will understand the counseling process and will practice counseling skills such as listening, attending and client goal setting.

B. Learner will understand basic testing principles, categories of tests, and will take and interpret selected interest inventories.

C. Learner will understand several occupational classification systems and career information resources.

D. Learner will be aware of other guidance procedures such as decision-making training, social modeling, achievement motivation training and values clarification.

E. Learner will know how to use the ERIC System and will search the system to identify career guidance strategies.

F. Learner will learn criteria which can be used to select career guidance strategies for his/her own program.

G. Learner will apply these criteria to select career guidance strategies to meet the goals established for his/her program.

Area IV - Career Guidance Program Development: Implementing, Evaluating, and Renewing Career Guidance Programs

This area will focus on helping learners develop skills in implementing, evaluating and renewing career guidance programs. Major concepts presented will include guidance staffing patterns, planned change strategies, types of program evaluation and uses of evaluation data for program revision.
Specific learner competencies include:

A. Learner will know possible role definitions of various guidance staff such as counselors, peers, community volunteers and paraprofessionals.

B. Learner will be able to differentiate between product and process evaluation.

C. Learner will develop skills needed to design program evaluation for his/her own work setting.

D. Learner will be aware of basic methods of using evaluation data to revise career guidance programs.

E. Learner will understand selected principles of planned change.

F. Learner will know how to complete a force-field analysis and develop program implementation strategies from that analysis.
ADDENDUM B

REFERENCE LIST

Note: These references utilize the APA preferred bibliographic style. ED numbers indicate that the reference is available through the Educational Resource Information Center (ERIC). Any library which has a standing collection of ERIC materials will have these resources. They will be on reserve at the ERIC Counseling and Personnel Services Information Center located in the School of Education.


Carlson, R. Building a psychological career awareness model: a field study to evaluate the effectiveness of achievement motivation simulation on career development. Washington: District of Columbia Public Schools, 1972. (ED 068 712)


Friel, T. The counselor guide to career decision-making skills: designed for use with the educational and career exploration system. Flint, Mich: Genesee Intermediate School District, 1972. (ED 084 432)


Swanson, M.T. Your volunteer program: organization and administration of volunteer programs. Ankeny, Iowa: Des Moines Area Community College, 1970. (ED 052 414)


### ADDENDUM C

#### COURSE PROCEDURES

**Session 1: Monday, October 6, 1975**

**Instructional Topic:** Area I - Career Development Theory  
**Pre-Session Learning Activity:** None  
**In-Session Learning:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Resource</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overview of course</td>
<td>Lecture and Questions</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of Learner's career development</td>
<td>Simulation</td>
<td>Career Development Activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Session 2: Tuesday, October 7, 1975**

**Instructional Topic:** Area I - Career Development Theory  
**Pre-Session Learning Activity:** Selected references on career development.  
**In-Session Learning:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Resource</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overview of career development theories</td>
<td>Lecture</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application of career development theories</td>
<td>Small group discussion</td>
<td>Career development case studies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Session 3: Wednesday, October 8, 1975**

**Instructional Topic:** Area II - Goal Setting  
**Pre-Session Learning Activity:** Selected references on client needs.  
**In-Session Learning:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Resource</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overview of needs assessment</td>
<td>Lecture</td>
<td>Overhead transparencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in needs assessment</td>
<td>Small group data collection</td>
<td>Needs Assessment Bingo Game</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop bank of needs assessment items</td>
<td>Small group brainstorming</td>
<td>Develop item bank for use by class</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Session 4: Thursday, October 9, 1975  

Instructional Topic: Area II - Goal Setting  
Area III - Designing Career Guidance Programs  

Pre-Session Learning Activity: Develop a tentative list of goals and objectives from sample needs assessment data.

In-Session Learning:

Activity: Develop goals and objectives from needs assessment  
Method: Small group  
Resource: Program Development Worksheet

Assessment of Area I  
Method: Examination

Overview of career guidance strategies  
Method: Lecture

Session 5: Friday, October 10, 1975  

Instructional Topic: Area III - Designing Career Guidance Programs  

Pre-Session Learning Activity: Take two interest inventories.  
Selected references on testing and counseling.

In-Session Learning:

Activity: Introduction to counseling  
Method: Lecture

Activity: Practice counseling skills  
Method: Role play in trios

Activity: Introduction to testing principles  
Method: Lecture

Activity: Introduction to types of tests  
Method: Browse through test materials

Back Home Assignments:

Conduct Needs Assessment Study  
Complete Career Development Self-Study

Resource: None

Overhead transparencies

Counseling Laboratory Test File
Session 6: Monday, November 17, 1975

Instructional Topic: Area III - Designing Career Guidance Programs
Pre-Session Learning Activity: Selected references on occupational classification systems and career information resources.

In-Session Learning:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Resource</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation of interest inventories</td>
<td>Group test interpretation</td>
<td>Interest inventory results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to occupational classification systems</td>
<td>Lecture</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to career information resources</td>
<td>Lecture</td>
<td>Occupational information materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Browsing through materials</td>
<td>Selected career information resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Session 7: Tuesday, November 18, 1975

Instructional Topic: Area III - Designing Career Guidance Programs
Pre-Session Learning Activity: Selected readings on career guidance methods.

In-Session Learning:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Resource</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overview of career guidance methods</td>
<td>Lecture</td>
<td>Bibliographies and chart of methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to ERIC</td>
<td>Mini-Workshop in career guidance methods</td>
<td>Selected career guidance materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demonstration</td>
<td>ERIC Center staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Session 8: Wednesday, November 19, 1975

Instructional Topic: Area III - Designing Career Guidance Methods
Pre-Session Learning Activity: Develop proposal for final project.
Session 8 - Con't

In-Session Learning:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Resource</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Search of ERIC materials, career guidance resources, and testing materials.</td>
<td>Individual activity</td>
<td>ERIC Center and Counseling Laboratory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval of final project</td>
<td>Individual conference with instructor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Session 9: Thursday, November 20, 1975

Instructional Topic: Area IV - Implementing, Evaluating and Renewing Career Guidance Programs

Pre-Session Learning Activity: Selected references on staffing and evaluation.

In-Session Learning:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Resource</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overview of staffing patterns</td>
<td>Lecture</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overview of evaluation</td>
<td>Lecture</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of evaluation instruments</td>
<td>Small group</td>
<td>Evaluation item samples</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Session 10: Friday, November 21, 1975

Instructional Topic: Area IV - Implementing, Evaluating and Renewing Career Guidance Programs

Pre-Session Learning Activity: Selected references on planned change.

In-Session Learning:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Resource</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to planned change</td>
<td>Mini-Workshop in planned change</td>
<td>Selected planned change materials</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Back Home Assignment
Complete Career Guidance Program Description
ADDENDUM D

EVALUATION

Four major assignments will provide the basis for course evaluation. These are:

A. Career Development Self-Study

This assignment calls for the learner to analyse his/her career development in light of career development theories thus exploring his/her own career pattern and choices in light of values, interests, achievements, abilities, life style, career role models, and decision making styles.

This is a required assignment but will not be graded. It will account for 10% of the final grade.

B. Examination

One one-hour examination will be given on Thursday, October 9th. This exam will cover Area I - Career Development Theory.

This assignment will account for 25% of the final grade.

C. Needs Assessment Study

This assignment will call for the learner to design, administer and interpret a needs assessment study. It will be assigned during the first week of the course and will be due Monday, November 17th.

This assignment will account for 25% of the final grade.

D. Career Guidance Program Description

This assignment will call for the learner to design a career guidance program to facilitate two to three of the priority goals established by the Needs Assessment Study. The Career Guidance Program Description must contain goals and objectives, guidance strategies, evaluation, staffing and implementation strategies. It will be due on or before December 8th.

This assignment will account for 40% of the final grade.
SEMINAR I

Occupational Education/Manpower Option
3 Semester Hours Credit
Developed by John T. Odbert

SEMINAR FOCUS

Seminar I will provide the participants with the opportunity to develop a comprehensive awareness and understanding of the components of manpower program development. Seminar II will focus on the actual development of manpower program components. Seminars I and II will also infuse the competencies from the related courses into a common core of 1) awareness, 2) understanding, and application skills.

Seminar I will focus on the identification and analysis of issues and needs which influence the successful development of comprehensive manpower programs and services. This seminar will constantly focus on the utilization and application of problem-solving techniques with special attention toward the following topic areas:

1. Manpower legislation: present, future and past.
2. Federal, state and local roles and responsibilities.
3. Funding resources and guidelines.
4. Identification of client-centered needs.
5. Manpower program development.

SEMINAR CONTENT

Please refer to Addendum A.

REFERENCE MATERIALS

No textbook will be required for this seminar. The seminar leader(s) will provide carefully selected reference materials
appropriate points during the seminar, those cases where books, articles, and/or references are not available for general distribution, participants have access to them at the Reserve Desk of the Graduate Library. The seminar leader(s), and selected resource persons, will also make periodic suggestions regarding materials an individual participant may wish to purchase.

Please refer to Addendum B for a general reference list for this seminar.

SEMINAR PROCEDURES

Please refer to Addendum C for:

1. Seminar Procedures
2. Seminar Expectations
3. Seminar Assignments
4. Campus Schedule
5. Field-Based Schedule

EVALUATION

Please refer to Addendum D for an outline of the evaluation criteria to be applied for this seminar.
OUTLINE OF SEMINAR CONTENT

AREA I: ACHIEVEMENT MOTIVATION SEMINAR

Participants will learn the theory and applications of the achievement motivation concept. The seminar will center around the participants' achievement motivation; however, the ultimate focus will be the application of theory in the daily administration of manpower programs.

Specific Competencies:
1. Describe the process of success identification.
2. Describe the process of strength identification.
3. Describe the process of value identification.
4. Describe the techniques of conflict management.
5. Describe the elements of goal setting.

AREA II: MANPOWER LEGISLATION: PRESENT, FUTURE AND PAST

Participants will review present, future and historical trends and issues in manpower legislation. This review will include the political, social and economic forces which resulted in manpower legislation. Selected pieces of manpower legislation will be analyzed to identify strengths, concerns, and ultimate outcomes. Special attention will be given to future trends in the development of manpower legislation.

Specific Competencies:
1. Describe the historical development of manpower legislation.
2. Describe the political, social and economic forces which influenced the current manpower legislation.
3. Describe the strengths, concerns and outcomes of selected pieces of manpower legislation.


AREA III: FEDERAL, STATE AND LOCAL ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Participants will examine the roles and responsibilities of various federal, state and local manpower agencies with special attention toward direct relationships with the prime sponsor.

Specific Competencies:

1. Describe the primary roles and responsibilities of the various federal agencies concerned with manpower programs.

2. Describe the primary roles and responsibilities of the various state agencies concerned with manpower programs.

3. Describe the primary roles and responsibilities of the local agencies concerned with manpower programs.

4. Describe the formal and informal relationships which exist between the prime sponsor and various support services and agencies.

AREA IV: FUNDING RESOURCES AND GUIDELINES

Participants will identify potential sources of manpower funds. Participants will examine manpower funding guidelines with special attention toward local applications.

Specific Competencies:

1. Identify manpower funding resources.
2. Interpret funding guidelines.

3. Apply manpower funding formula.

4. Identify innovative needs and services.

**AREA V: IDENTIFICATION OF CLIENT-CENTERED NEEDS**

Participants will identify client-centered needs with special attention toward the identification of local priorities and requirements.

**Specific Competencies:**

1. Describe recruitment functions.

2. Describe placement functions.

3. Outline client flow system(s).

4. Determine program selection priorities.

**AREA VI: MANPOWER PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT**

Participants will identify the occupational and educational components involved in the successful development of manpower programs. Special attention will be given toward the development of a broad, comprehensive awareness of occupational and educational services and needs.

**Specific Competencies:**

1. Describe occupational preparation steps.

2. Describe teaching-learning strategies.

3. Describe components of curriculum development.

4. Plan training programs.

5. Identify target job requirements.
ADDENDUM B

REFERENCE LIST


Evans, Rupert N. Foundations of Vocational Education. Columbus: Merrill, 1971.


NOTE: These references are provided as a general reference for participants. Selected reference materials will be distributed at appropriate points during the seminar. Materials not available for general distribution will be placed at the Reserve Desk of the Graduate Library under the title: Education E-663/ Seminar I.
SEMINAR PROCEDURES

I - SEMINAR PROCEDURES

A. Campus-Based Seminar (30 contact hours)

1. Approximately eighteen hours of seminar time will be utilized to provide intensive instruction. A variety of resource persons will be used to provide specialized content and instruction.

2. Approximately twelve hours of seminar time will be utilized for interaction and discussion among the participants, resource person(s), and seminar leader(s).

3. Some seminar time will be utilized for 1) evaluation, 2) advanced organizing, 3) project development, and 4) dissemination of information.

4. Some non-seminar time will be required for completion of assignments and selected readings.

B. Field-Based Mini-Seminars (15 contact hours)

1. Approximately four mini-seminars will be provided for each participant on a regional basis.

II - SEMINAR EXPECTATIONS

A. Each participant is expected to attend and actively participate in all campus and field-based seminars.

B. Each participant is expected to complete assigned activities and readings by the dates specified.

C. Each participant is expected to take a final examination and complete a seminar evaluation form at the last meeting.

III - SEMINAR ASSIGNMENTS

A. Participants will be required to complete all required assignments, in writing, by the dates specified.
B. Participants will be required to follow the written guidelines which will be provided for each assignment.

IV - CAMPUS SEMINAR SCHEDULE

A. First Friday Evening
1. Introduction to seminar (1 hour)
2. Advanced organizing (1/2 hour)
3. Planning (1/2 hour)

B. First Saturday
1. Achievement Motivation Seminar (8 hours)
   a. Two resource persons - both A.M.S. trainers
2. Assignment

C. Second Friday Evening
1. Manpower Legislation: present, future and past (2 hours)
   a. Two resource persons: 1) one federal legislator, 2) one federal manpower specialist
   b. Discussion/Interaction (2 hours)

D. Second Saturday
1. Roles and Responsibilities: federal, state and local (2 hours)
   a. Three resource persons: 1) one federal manpower specialist, 2) one state manpower specialist, 3) one local manpower specialist
2. **Funding Resources and Guidelines** (2 hours)
   
   a. Three resource persons: 1) one federal funding specialist, 2) one state funding specialist, 3) one local funding specialist.

E. **Third Friday Evening**

1. **Identification of Client Centered Needs** (2 hours)
   
   a. Two resource persons: both client services' specialists

2. **Discussion Interaction** (1 hour)

3. **Final business** (1 hour)

F. **Third Saturday**

1. **Manpower Program Development** (2 hours)
   
   a. Two resource persons: both manpower program planning and development specialists.

2. **Discussion/Interaction** (2 hours)

3. **Seminar Evaluation** (1/2 hour)

4. **Final Examination** (1 1/2 hours)

V - FIELD-BASED MINI-SEMINAR SCHEDULE

A. **First Evening** (4 contact hours)

1. **Identify local roles and responsibilities**
   
   a. One local resource person

2. **Discussion/Interaction**
B. Second Evening (4 contact hours)
   1. Identify local funding resources and guidelines.
      a. One local resource person
   2. Discussion/Interaction

C. Third Evening (4 contact hours)
   1. Identify local client-centered needs.
      a. One local resource person
   2. Discussion/Interaction

D. Fourth Evening (4 contact hours)
   1. Identify local manpower program development needs.
      a. One local resource person
   2. Discussion/Interaction
A. Assignments

1. Four performance-based assignments will be required.

2. Each assignment will provide specific evaluation criteria and format guidelines.

3. Each assignment will determine 15 per cent of the final grade.

B. Final Examination

1. The final examination will determine 20 per cent of the final grade.

C. Seminar Participation

1. The seminar leader(s) will determine 20 per cent of the final grade based on the level of active participation in the seminars.
E663: SEMINAR II

Occupational Education/Manpower Option
2 Semester Hours Credit
Developed by John T. Odbert

SEMINAR FOCUS

This seminar will focus on the development and application of 1) planning skills, 2) operating skills, and 3) evaluation skills as they relate to the delivery of manpower programs and services.

This seminar will enable the participant to apply these key skills toward the development and implementation of:

1. Operational and organizational guidelines.
2. Employment delivery systems.
3. Educational delivery systems.
4. Occupational information systems.
5. Manpower support services.

SEMINAR CONTENT

Please refer to Addendum A.

REFERENCE MATERIALS

No textbook will be required for this seminar. The seminar leader(s) will provide carefully selected reference materials at appropriate points during the seminar. In those cases where books, articles, and/or reference materials are not available for general distribution, participants will have access to them at the Reserve Desk of the Graduate Library. The seminar leader(s), and selected resource persons, will also make periodic suggestions regarding materials an individual participant may wish to purchase.

Please refer to Addendum B for a general reference list for this seminar.
2. Develop comprehensive manpower program plans.
3. Identify program evaluation criteria.
4. Develop, monitor, and evaluate fiscal information.

AREA III: EMPLOYMENT DELIVERY SYSTEMS

Participants will explore various employment delivery systems with special attention toward the development of local employment delivery systems.

Specific Competencies:

1. Develop subsidized and public service employment options.
2. Describe employment requirements and outcomes.
3. Develop experimental and/or demonstration employment programs.
4. Utilize job restructuring and job development techniques.
5. Identify employment expectations of employers and employees.

AREA IV: EDUCATIONAL DELIVERY SYSTEMS

Participants will explore various educational delivery systems with special attention toward the development of local educational delivery systems.

Specific Competencies:

1. Develop institutional training plans, contracts, and agreements.
2. Develop educational counseling, assessment, testing, and placement procedures.
3. Write educational goal statements and performance objectives.

4. Identify the psychomotor, cognitive, and affective skill requirements of occupations.

5. Utilize qualitative and quantitative evaluation techniques.

6. Design experimental and/or demonstration training programs.

7. Identify educational delivery systems.

AREA V: OCCUPATIONAL INFORMATION SYSTEMS

Participants will explore various occupational information systems with special attention toward the development of local occupational information systems.

Specific Competencies:

1. Utilize occupational information systems to:
   a. write job descriptions
   b. determine wage and salary characteristics
   c. identify the occupational outlook
   d. identify occupational requirements

2. Describe occupational clusters, career ladders-lattices, and job classification systems.

3. Evaluate occupational information resources.

AREA VI: MANPOWER SUPPORT SERVICES

Participants will explore a variety of manpower support needs with special attention toward the development of local manpower support services.

Specific Competencies:

1. Develop recruitment and orientation procedures.
2. Develop intake, referral, and routing procedures.
3. Develop inter-agency communication procedures.
4. Provide comprehensive counseling services.
ADDENDUM A
OUTLINE OF SEMINAR CONTENT

AREA I: MANAGEMENT BY OBJECTIVES (M.B.O.)

Participants will learn the general principles and techniques of management by objectives with special attention toward immediate applications in their work setting.

Specific Competencies:

1. Utilize management by objectives (MBO) techniques to:
   a. plan local programs
   b. operate local programs
   c. evaluate local programs

2. Develop organizational performance criteria

3. Clarify personal goals and values

4. Develop human relation skills and techniques

AREA II: OPERATIONAL AND ORGANIZATIONAL GUIDELINES

Participants will review federal and state guidelines with special attention toward the development of local manpower guidelines.

Specific Competencies:

1. Develop guidelines for:
   a. administrative operations
   b. technical assistance
   c. program activities and services
   d. organization and staffing
   e. fiscal activities
   f. management information
   g. program assessment and evaluation
   h. manpower planning council
SEMINAR PROCEDURES

Please refer to Addendum C for:

1. Seminar Procedures
2. Seminar Expectations
3. Seminar Assignments
4. Campus Schedule
5. Field-Based Schedule

EVALUATION

Please refer to Addendum D for an outline of the evaluation criteria to be applied for this seminar.
ADDENDUM B

REFERENCE LIST


NOTE: These references are provided as a general reference for participants. Selected reference materials will be distributed at appropriate points during the seminar. Materials not available for general distribution will be placed at the Reserve Desk of the Graduate Library under the title: Education E-663/Seminar II.
ADDENDUM C

SEMINAR PROCEDURES

I - SEMINAR PROCEDURES

A. Campus-Based Seminar (30 contact hours)

1. Approximately eighteen hours of seminar time will be utilized to provide intensive instruction. A variety of resource persons will be used to provide specialized content and instruction.

2. Approximately twelve hours of seminar time will be utilized for interaction and discussion among the participants, resource person(s), and seminar leader(s).

3. Some seminar time will be utilized for 1) evaluation, 2) advanced organizing, 3) project development, and 4) dissemination of information.

4. Some non-seminar time will be required for completion of assignments and selected readings.

B. Field-Based Mini-Seminars (15 contact hours)

1. Approximately four mini-seminars will be provided for each participant on a regional basis.

II - SEMINAR EXPECTATIONS

A. Each participant is expected to attend and actively participate in all campus and field-based seminars.

B. Each participant is expected to complete assigned activities and readings by the dates specified.

C. Each participant is expected to take a final examination and complete a seminar evaluation form at the last meeting.

III - SEMINAR ASSIGNMENTS

A. Participants will be required to complete all required assignments, in writing, by the dates specified.
B. Participants will be required to follow the written guidelines, which will be provided for each assignment.

IV - CAMPUS SEMINAR SCHEDULE

A. First Friday Evening
1. Introduction to seminar (1 hour)
2. Advanced organizing (1/2 hour)
3. Planning (1/2 hour)

B. First Saturday
1. Management by Objectives (8 hours)
   a. Two resource persons - both M.B.O. trainers
2. Assignment

C. Second Friday Evening
1. Operational and Organizational Guidelines (2 hours)
   a. Three resource persons: 1) one federal specialist
      2) one state specialist, 3) one local specialist.
2. Discussion/Interaction (2 hours)

D. Second Saturday
1. Employment Delivery Systems (2 hours)
   a. Two resource persons: both employment specialists.
2. Discussion/Interaction (1 hour)
3. Educational Delivery Systems (2 hours)
   a. Three resource persons: 1) one adult education specialist, 2) one vocational education specialist, 3) one placement specialist.
4. Discussion/Interaction (1 hour)

5. Assignment

E. Third Friday Evening

1. Occupational Information Systems (2 hours)
   a. Two resource persons: 1) one occupational information specialist, 2) one career education specialist.

2. Discussion/Interaction (1 hour)

3. Final business (1 hour)

F. Third Saturday

1. Manpower Support Services (2 hours)
   a. Two resource persons: both client-service specialists.

2. Discussion/Interaction (2 hours)

3. Seminar evaluation (2 hours)

4. Final examination (1 1/2 hours)

V - FIELD-BASED MINI-SEMINAR SCHEDULE

A. First Evening (4 contact hours)

1. Planning local manpower programs and services.
   a. One local resource person

2. Discussion of participants' planning strategies.

B. Second Evening (4 contact hours)

1. Operating local manpower programs and services.
   a. One local resource person
2. Discussion of participants' local operating guidelines.

C. Third Evening (4 contact hours)
   1. Evaluating local manpower programs
      a. One local resource person
   2. Discussion of participants' local evaluation plans.

D. Fourth Evening (4 contact hours)
   1. Future needs assessment
      a. One local resource person
   2. Discussion of participants' medium and long-range plans.
EXTERNSHIP COURSE OUTLINE
Developed by Dan Brown

COURSE FOCUS

The externship will be a competency-based extension of the on-campus program. In combination with the seminar sessions, the externship will provide a planned, individually prescribed program of educational field experiences. Externship experiences will be selected with the mutual agreement of the student, the participating agency, and the University of Michigan. Primary emphasis will be placed upon satisfying the educational needs of the individual learner.

COURSE CONTENT

1. Instructional Content (See Addendum A.)
2. List of Externship Competencies (See Addendum B.)
3. Externship Objectives

A standard set of course performance objectives will not be developed for the externship experience. The field-based experience will, however, be objectives based (competency based). See section on COURSE PROCEDURES below for description of objectives technique to be employed.
4. Schedule

Externship-related learning activities will be scheduled as needed into all seminar sessions. No specific topic outline will be employed because of the problem-solving, competency-based nature of the related learning activities.
1. Reference materials used to support externship activities will be drawn as needed from those used to support the basic instructional activities of the program. Should the need arise, supplementary reference materials will be identified and assigned.

2. Consistent with the approach described herein, no complete reference list is available in advance other than those published for other segments of this program. A complete record will be maintained for all supplementary reference materials which may be required to support externship-related instructional activities.

COURSE PROCEDURES

1. See Addendum A for description of conduct of individual sessions of in-class activity related to the externship experience.

2. The externship experience will be a planned, mutually agreed upon field-based learning experience employing both the standards of the cooperating institution and a system of management by objectives (MBO).

   a. Planned. Each externship placement will be selected from those available with the individual needs of a particular student in mind. Extensive discussion between the UoF representative, the cooperating institution, and the student will be undertaken to get the best match of student needs and cooperating institution capabilities.

   b. Mutually agreed upon. Each student placement will be accompanied by a written training agreement signed by all three parties to the experience: student, cooperating institution, and UofM representative. The format employed will be the standard format currently
utilized for UofM Occupational Education cooperative education students. Such significant elements as days and dates of externship, identification of supervisor, place of externship, etc., will be noted and understood by all parties.

c. Field-based learning experience. The externship experience is not to be viewed as an opportunity for part-time employment or simply the chance to observe an ongoing operation by either the student or the cooperating institution. The primary purpose of this experience is to extend the learning activities of the student beyond the UofM classroom experiences.

d. Cooperating institution's standards. The extern will be subject to a performance review utilizing the evaluation procedures and instruments of the cooperating institution. In addition to whatever special activities agreed to as a part of the training agreement (see (b) above) or through specially developed MBO (see (e) below), the student will be expected to carry out his externship activities and conduct him/herself in a manner consistent with the established standards of the cooperating institution.

e. Management by objectives. Each individual training agreement will be supported by an individually prepared set of MBO agreed to by all parties. This set of objectives is to be executed whether or not the cooperating institution employs MBO with its own staff. The initial MBO are to be developed and agreed to by all parties within one month of placement. Monthly progress reports by the student to both the cooperating institution and UofM are required.
SESSION

1. A reasonable and adequate period of time of each total seminar session will be devoted to handling externship-related instructional activities and problem solving.

2. The content and scheduling of each externship seminar session will be jointly developed between the UofM staff member assigned to the seminar and the Externship Committee. This committee will be composed of selected members of the student group.

3. Primary use of time designated to support externship-related activities will be committed to problem solving which is of value as a group experience. Individual student problems will be dealt with at times other than the limited amount of group time available to support externship-related activities.

4. Instructional content designed to support activities specifically related to the externship will receive second priority. This content may include speakers from sponsoring institutions, case studies of actual student externship activities, outside speakers or activities, or other such experiences specifically selected to assist the students in the development of one or more competencies.

INSTRUCTIONAL TOPIC(S)

1. As previously indicated, instructional content specifically designed to support externship-related activities will be mutually agreed to by the instructor and the Externship Committee.
2. Particular emphasis will be placed upon instructional topics which will:
   a. satisfy needs of the student group in externship activities
   b. develop specific competencies identified in the field and/or in class.

PRE-SESSION LEARNING ACTIVITIES (ASSIGNMENTS)

1. No specific text or materials will be used to support externship activities.

2. Assignments, if any, will be related to specific field-based competencies under development as reflected in externship objectives (see MBO material elsewhere in this course outline).

IN-SESSION LEARNING ACTIVITIES

The above material describes problem-solving, externship-related nature of in-session learning activities. Each learning activity should be supported by an identification of the competency under development, description of the activity and method to be employed, and selection of the appropriate resource(s).
Utilize existing educational resources.
Operate area manpower research.
Execute work and training policy.
Execute discrimination policy.
Execute political activity policy.
Execute criminal provision policy.
Maintain Labor Department Relations.
Operate Job Corps Program.
Conduct manpower demonstration program.
Operate manpower service.
Operate public employment program.
Operate manpower program.
Manage manpower program.
Coordinate Regional Training Programs.
Develop required reports.
Submit grant application.
Prepare grant application.
Establish comprehensive manpower services.

Develop CETA consortia.
Establish Manpower Council.
Request on-site technical assistance.
Recruit client jobs.
Develop client job.
Restructure client job.
Apply CETA priorities.
Coordinate two prime sponsor area educational resources.
Apply CETA policies.
Coordinate prime sponsor educational resources.
Process client information.
Process program impact information.
Use intra-agency communication techniques.
Schedule staff development opportunities.
Maintain records.
Write news releases.
Provide consultation.
Chair committee meeting.
Lead small group discussion.
ADDENDUM B (continued)

Apply affirmative action regulations.

Supervise employees.

Disseminate program information.

Regulate client flow.

Advertise program options.

Set service priorities.

Implement client employment plan.

Develop client employment plan.

Select service operators.

Select coordinating methods.

Match client priority groups with priority employment.

Develop assessment services.

Develop intake services.

Develop outreach/recruitment services.

Use CETA guides.

Use referral sources; e.g., schools, social welfare offices, employment service, parole boards, probation offices, churches, service clubs, others).

Use job development techniques.

Use job creation techniques.

Use job solicitation techniques.

Use job placement techniques.

Use job retention techniques.

Determine prime sponsor program operators.

Coordinate employment services.

Coordinate subsidized employment.

Coordinate client "appeal" services.

Coordinate vocational education services.

Coordinate client basic education.

Coordinate client counseling.

Coordinate client testing.

Coordinate client coaching.

Coordinate classroom training.

Coordinate CETA orientation.

Coordinate transitional public employment.

Coordinate client O-J-T.

Coordinate intake.

Coordinate staff outreach effort.

Coordinate support services.

Recommend program improvements.

Recommend priority occupational training areas.

Plan inservice training programs.
### Sample Management by Objectives Format

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task/Objective</th>
<th>Evaluation/Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Routine: (those repetitive tasks which do not require constant supervision of</td>
<td>(List objective criteria for successful attainment of objective, including timelines.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student and which may be performed on a daily or weekly basis)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special or Problem Solving: (one-time and/or significant tasks which require</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>special supervision and effort)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continue on other pages as necessary)

Accepted by:
- Student
- Cooperating Institution
- UofM

Date ____________________________
A. Assignments

1. Four performance-based assignments will be required.

2. Each assignment will provide specific evaluation criteria and format guidelines.

3. Each assignment will determine 15 percent of the final grade.

B. Final Examination

1. The final examination will determine 20 percent of the final grade.

C. Seminar Participation

1. The seminar leader(s) will determine 20 percent of the final grade based on the level of active participation in the seminars.
SPECIAL PROBLEMS IN OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION
E561 - Two Semester Hours
MLP Spring 1976
Vogler/Tuma

COURSE FOCUS

An individual or small group (5 or less persons) studies employment/training problem.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS

1. Based upon local need, and/or personal need, and/or personal interest, the student(s) will identify a problem and develop a plan for addressing the problem. (See Addendum A for copy of plan format.)

2. The plan will be submitted to Dan Vogler and/or Joe Tuma for approval, and/or suggestions, and/or rejection. This must be completed by May 7, 1976.

3. The student(s) will execute approved plan.

4. The student will report orally and/or in writing, problem progress by May 28, 1976, and June 15, 1976.

5. The student will submit product(s) of study to Dan Vogler and/or Joe Tuma no later than June 23, 1976.

EVALUATION

Dan Vogler and/or Joe Tuma will translate your performance to a grade. The following criteria and proportion of importance will be used.

Problem Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Importance - based upon rationale</th>
<th>Clarity of Intent - based upon objective</th>
<th>Completion - based upon format</th>
<th>Appearance - based upon style and errorlessness</th>
<th>Promptness - based upon a plan submitted by May 7, 1976 time line</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Plan Approval

Points

25 Plan approved as submitted - 5 points will be deducted for each additional submission

Progress Reports

10 5 points for each of two reports submitted
10 5 points for each of two reports indicating progress in accord with task time line of plan

Final Product

20 Product consistent with plan
10 Appearance - based upon style and errorlessness

Total Points

100

TRANSLATION KEY

A+ 96-100 Points  B  76-81 Points
A  90-95 Points    B- 70-75 Points
A- 88-94 Points   C+ 69-74 Points
B+ 82-87 Points   C  63-68 Points

Less than 63 points
STATEMENT OF STUDY PROBLEM

(Provide approximately 100 words describing the study problem.)

RATIONALE FOR STUDY PROBLEM

(List 5 reasons why this problem should be addressed.)

STUDY QUESTIONS

(List questions which must be answered in order to address the "problem.")

STUDY OBJECTIVES

(List probable products for answering "study questions.")

STUDY TASKS AND TIME LINE

(Provide a detailed list, including deadline dates, of the things you must do in order to answer the "study questions.")

STUDY REPORT

(Indicate the tangible thing(s) that Dan Vogler and/or Joe Tuma should expect on or before June 23, 1976.)
APPENDIX C

SELECTION FORMS
We invite you to submit from one to three nominees for a proposed inservice, graduate Manpower Leadership Program. Contingent upon funding, the program should begin September, 1975.

The following conditions should exist for any person you nominate:

1. The nominee has completed a bachelor's degree.
2. The nominee is currently employed and under your direct or contractual supervision.
3. The nominee has exhibited promise as a leader of manpower.
4. You would be willing to help plan and enter into an externship for the nominee in your manpower operation.
5. You would permit the nominee to be absent from work to participate in approximately twenty-one work days of intensive, on-campus instruction from September, 1975, to June, 1976.

The selected participants will be required to enroll for twenty semester hours of graduate credit. Rigorous, concurrent externship, seminars, and manpower leadership related courses will be used to develop the leadership program. Exposure to high talent instructors and resource persons, competency-based instruction, and the field-based externship should provide an optimal theory/practice blend. The credit earned will, without loss, be applicable toward a Master's Degree in Comprehensive Occupational Education.

Continued...
Contingent upon funding, the tuition and related instructional costs to the selected participants will be provided by the Program. The selected participant should continue on salary in your organization during the program.

Enclosed please find a nomination form for your convenience. Should you have questions or desire additional input for your Prime Sponsor, I would be pleased to assist you. My address and phone number may be found on the letterhead. I will contact your nominees to invite them to apply to the program.

Sincerely yours,

Daniel E. Vogler
Proposed Manpower Leadership Program
The University of Michigan
Occupational Education Programs

NOMINATIONS FOR MANPOWER LEADERSHIP PROGRAM
1975-76

Do you have in your organization persons meeting the conditions described in paragraph two of the cover letter? If so, please list the name(s) and address(es) of your nominee(s) below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Full Name</th>
<th>Home Address</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Name of Person Submitting Nomination
Position
Organization
Address

Please return this form immediately to:
Manpower Leadership Program
Occupational Education Programs
The School of Education
The University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104
**TERM I COURSES**  
(Sept.-Dec.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E518 Externship</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E663 Seminar</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J607 Guidance &amp; Counseling</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW610 Social Work</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TERM II COURSES**  
(Jan.-April)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E518 Externship</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E663 Seminar</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B650 Administration</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC424 Economics</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TERM III COURSES**  
(May-June)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E561 Independent Study</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**9 Semester Hours**  

**TIME SCHEDULE**

**Fall Term**

September 5 (6)  
8-12 Extern Visits  
15-19 Extern Visits  
22-26(27) Campus: Seminar Friday p.m., and Saturday  
29-30  

October 1-3  
6-10 Campus: Guidance and Social Work Courses  
13-17 Field-Based Mini-Seminar; Extern Visits  
20-24 Field-Based Mini-Seminar; Extern Visits  
27-31(1) Campus: Seminar Friday p.m., and Saturday  

November 3-7 Field-Based Mini-Seminar; Extern Visits  
10-14 Field-Based Mini-Seminar; Extern Visits  
17-21 Campus: Guidance and Social Work Courses  
24-28 Field-Based Mini-Seminar; Extern Visits  

December 1-5 Field-Based Mini-Seminar; Extern Visits  
8-12(13) Campus: Seminar Friday p.m., and Saturday
## TIME SCHEDULE

### Winter Term

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>January</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Campus: Registration, planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12-16</td>
<td>Campus: Economics and Administration Courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19-23</td>
<td>Field-Based Mini Seminar; Extern Visits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26-30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>2-6</td>
<td>Field-Based Mini-Seminar; Extern Visits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9-13</td>
<td>Field-Based Mini-Seminar; Extern Visits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>Campus: Economics and Administration Courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23-27</td>
<td>Field-Based Mini-Seminar; Extern Visits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>Field-Based Mini-Seminar; Extern Visits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8-12(13)</td>
<td>Campus: Seminar Friday p.m., and Saturday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>Field-Based Mini-Seminar; Extern Visits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22-26</td>
<td>Field-Based Mini-Seminar; Extern Visits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29-31(1)</td>
<td>Campus: Seminar Friday p.m., and Saturday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>Field-Based Mini-Seminar; Extern Visits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>Field-Based Mini-Seminar; Extern Visits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12-16(17)</td>
<td>Campus: Seminar Friday p.m., and Saturday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19-23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26-30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Spring Half Term

| May/June | | |
|----------| | ||| Independent Study |
DATE: June 17, 1975

TO: Daniel E. Vogler
Manpower Leadership Program

We are pleased to invite you to come to Ann Arbor for the next step in our Manpower Leadership Development Program selection process. Those applicants who have met certain basic criteria will be interviewed. On the form which you returned, you indicated an interest in the program and a willingness to come to Ann Arbor for a day (at your own expense) to be interviewed. You are scheduled for interviewing on Wednesday, June 25, 1975. The enclosed interview schedule will indicate the hour for your interview.

All participants will be our guests for lunch. Several members of the staff will join the group at 12:00 Noon. The luncheon will provide an opportunity to discuss the Manpower Leadership Program and answer some of your questions about it.

Please report directly to Room 4003 in the School of Education. Every attempt has been made to schedule those who must travel the longest distance for the late morning or early afternoon.

Enclosed is a map of the campus showing the location of the School of Education (115) and the Michigan Union (142). We suggest you use the municipal parking structure on Forest Street (120 on the map). This structure has meters; you will need $1.50 in assorted change, or six quarters.

We are pleased that you are interested in this program and we will look forward to seeing you in Ann Arbor on June 25, 1975, unless we hear from you to the contrary.

DEV/1k
The University of Michigan
LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM FOR
MANPOWER PERSONNEL

Please answer the following questions and return this form immediately to Manpower, Occupational Education Programs, School of Education, The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104.

**PLEASE TYPE OR PRINT**

### PERSONAL DATA

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NAME</strong></td>
<td><strong>Last</strong></td>
<td><strong>First</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HOME ADDRESS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>City</strong></td>
<td><strong>Zip</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HOME PHONE</strong> (Include Area Code)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POSITION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INSTIT. OR AGENCY NAME</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BUS. ADDRESS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>City</strong></td>
<td><strong>Zip</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BUS. PHONE</strong> (Include Area Code)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DATE OF BIRTH</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>SOCIAL SECURITY NO.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Married</strong></td>
<td><strong>Single</strong></td>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Height</strong></td>
<td><strong>Weight</strong></td>
<td><strong>General Physical Condition</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### EDUCATIONAL HISTORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEGREE</th>
<th>DATE RECEIVED</th>
<th>MAJOR FIELD</th>
<th>INSTITUTION</th>
<th>GRADE PT.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. **Have you completed any course work beyond your last degree?**
   **If yes, how many semester hours?** ________ **When did you take this work?** ________ **Where?** ________

11. **Have you completed the above work toward an advanced degree?**
   **If yes, for what degree?** ________

12. **Do you hold any occupational or professional credentials (e.g., registration, certificate, journeyman card, etc.)?** Please list.
13. Report below all full-time and part-time work experience. Begin with most recent work experience, including your present position.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates of Employment</th>
<th>Number of Months Worked</th>
<th>Aver. Hrs. Per Week</th>
<th>Title of Position (or work performed)</th>
<th>Name and Address of Business</th>
<th>Describe duties and nature of work, including supervisory responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NAME

145
14. List any leadership roles in state and national professional associations, occupationally oriented organizations, or professional fraternities which you have held or now hold (such as state-wide committees, offices held, or other elected or appointed positions).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEADERSHIP POSITIONS HELD</th>
<th>WHEN HELD</th>
<th>APPOINTED OR ELECTED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. List any leadership roles in your community which you now hold or have held in the past (such as committee chairmanship, offices held in organizations, or other elected or appointed positions in the community).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEADERSHIP POSITIONS HELD</th>
<th>WHEN HELD</th>
<th>APPOINTED OR ELECTED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following space is reserved for any additional information that you would like to provide. You may include any contributions to your profession, or any professional activities not reported elsewhere in this form.
17. Please check the appropriate point on the scale to indicate the percentage of time you now spend in administrative and/or supervisory duties.

0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100

18. What is your current annual salary? Place an X in the appropriate area. This information is required in order for the program to derive cost effectiveness information.

6 8 10 12 14 16 18 20 22 24 26

(Thousands)

19. Why are you applying for this program?

20. What are your professional plans for the future?
21. Would you be willing to come to Ann Arbor for a day at your own expense to be interviewed and to take a test as part of the selection procedure?  
Yes ____  No ____

If yes, circle the date you would prefer to come. We will make every effort to assign you on the date you request, but we may have to assign you on the alternate date.

June 25  June 26

22. If you are selected for the program, would you be willing to participate in an on-the-job (externship) experience in an administrative or supervisory position during the academic year 1975-76?  
Yes ____  No ____

23. If selected for the program, would you be willing to travel to Ann Arbor for three weekend seminars per term?  
Yes ____  No ____

24. If you are selected for the program, would you be willing to live in Ann Arbor one week in each of four months for intensive instruction?  
Yes ____  No ____

25. If selected for the program, would you be willing to participate in Friday-Saturday seminars?  
Yes ____  No ____

REFERENCES

26. Give name and address of three references including (1) your present immediate supervisor; (2) your immediate supervisor in former position, if any; and (3) other.

(1) NAME ___________________________ POSITION ___________________________
INSTIT. OR AGENCY ___________________________
ADDRESS ____________________________________________

(2) NAME ___________________________ POSITION ___________________________
INSTIT. OR AGENCY ___________________________
ADDRESS ____________________________________________

(3) NAME ___________________________ POSITION ___________________________
INSTIT. OR AGENCY ___________________________
ADDRESS ____________________________________________
July 7, 1975

It gives me great pleasure to invite you to participate in the 1975-76 Manpower Leadership Program. Your participation is contingent upon acceptance of our invitation, the submission of a formal application to The University of Michigan, the final settlement of the inservice externship, and funding of the grant proposal.

As discussed during the interviews, the proposed program will include an externship, seminars, and course work. The program will be a funded, experimental approach to inservice manpower leadership development. We are, and hope you are, excited about the opportunity.

We need to know as soon as possible whether or not you will accept this invitation to participate in the Manpower Leadership Program. Therefore, please write me a letter of acceptance or regret. I need this letter by July 15, 1975.

If you accept our invitation, please:

1. Read the enclosed University of Michigan Bulletin.
2. Read the enclosed Advanced Studies in Education.
3. Read page 3 of yellow application.
4. Complete yellow application.

Continued...
5. Forward transcripts per item 11 on application.

6. Forward application, without application fee, to:
The University of Michigan, Horace H. Rackham School
of Graduate Studies, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104. This
must be done immediately!

Upon receipt of your application, and funding from the
sponsor, we will contact you regarding the next step(s). We
suggest no publicity at this time. Should you have additional
questions, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely yours,

Daniel E. Vogler
Associate Professor
Manpower Leadership Program
Occupational Education Programs
1. Full Name
2. Social Security Number
3. Mailing Address
4. Home Address
5. Female
6. Male
7. Single
8. Married
9. U.S. Citizen
10. Non-U.S. Citizen
11. Previously applied? Yes □ No □
12. Field of specialization (See p. 4)
13. Degree sought:
   Master's □ Professional (Specialist) □ Doctor's □ Not Candidate for Degree □
14. Location of proposed enrollment:
   Ann Arbor □ U-M, Dearborn □ Flint □ Grand Rapids □ Saginaw □
15. Previous Education: List in chronological order all colleges and universities attended in the United States. You must submit to the Graduate School one transcript from each institution listed before this application can be sent to the departmental committee. See Application Brochure about "Pass-Fail" grades.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Dates of Attendance</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Field of Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Master's Occupational Education of Manpower</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Professional (Specialist) Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Doctor's Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Not Candidate for Degree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
16. Term of proposed enrollment: Continued on page 2. If also applying for a fellowship, please read Instructions H.
17. Degree sought: Ann Arbor □ U-M, Dearborn □ Flint □ Grand Rapids □ Saginaw □
July 7, 1975

Those of us who had the responsibility for selecting the individuals to participate in the Manpower Leadership Program have just completed a most difficult task. After reviewing the records of very well-qualified candidates, we have finally selected those we consider to have the highest potential and the best qualifications for leadership roles in manpower. We are sorry that we could not accept more participants into the program. Many excellent applicants had to be excluded.

Although we were not able to include you in the group selected for this year’s program, we are still interested in helping you in any way we can to prepare yourself for a more significant role in the further development of Michigan manpower. Therefore, if you are interested in exploring other possibilities through which you might prepare yourself for a leadership position and would like to discuss this matter, I would be pleased to hear from you.

Sincerely yours,

Daniel E. Vogler
Associate Professor
Occupational Education Programs
APPENDIX D

MANPOWER LEADERSHIP PROGRAM
RESOURCE MATERIALS
MANPOWER LEADERSHIP PROGRAM
RESOURCE MATERIALS


Center for Vocational Education. Evaluation of Work Experience, Cooperative Education, and Youth Manpower Programs: An Annotated Bibliography. (Bibliography Series No. 28.) Columbus, Ohio: The Center for Vocational Education, The Ohio State University, October 1975.
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MANPOWER LEADERSHIP EDUCATION PROGRAM

The Manpower Leadership Education Program at The University of Michigan, consisting of two components, was launched in September 1975. Twenty manpower practitioners are currently enrolled in the program's graduate degree program component. The second component consists of a series of three one-day state-wide workshops for manpower officials.

THE CONFERENCE ADVISORY BOARD

The Program's Conference Advisory Board has planned the first of the three conferences for November 15, 1975 at the Rackham Amphitheater on The University of Michigan campus in Ann Arbor. The two additional conferences are tentatively scheduled for January and March of 1976 at other locations in the state.

ADVISORY BOARD MEMBERS

Price Banks, Director, Livingston County Department of Internal Affairs
Alan Becker, Deputy Director, Manpower Department, City of Detroit
Paul Bigley, Director, Region II Manpower Consortium
Alan Briscoe, CETA Director, Flint, Genesee, Lapeer, Shiawasee Counties
Thomas Hazlewood, Director, Central Upper Peninsula Manpower Consortium
Robert Pendleton, Deputy Director, Bureau of Manpower, State Department of Labor

ACADEMIC CREDIT

University of Michigan academic credit is available for those attending all three conferences. If credit is desired, contact Professor Daniel E. Vogler, Occupational Education Programs, The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor (phone 313/764-8423).
9:00- 9:30 a.m. REGISTRATION

9:30-10:45 a.m. OPENING COMMENTS

Daniel E. Vogler, Director, Manpower Leadership Education Program, The University of Michigan

Wilbur J. Cohen, Dean of the School of Education, The University of Michigan

"THE EMPLOYMENT OUTLOOK IN MICHIGAN"

William Haber, Former Dean of the College of Literature, Science and the Arts; Professor of Economics, Emeritus; Advisor to the Executive Officers of the University.

10:45-11:15 COFFEE BREAK

11:15-12:30 REACTOR PANEL

Introductions:

Joseph V. Tuma, Coordinator, Manpower Leadership Education Program, The University of Michigan

Moderator:

Ralph Wenrich, Professor, Occupational Education Programs, The University of Michigan

Panel Members:

Paul Sigley, Director, Region II Manpower Consortium
Hon. Wendell Brooks, Chairperson, Northwest Michigan Manpower Consortium
Hon. Herman Ivory, Chairperson, Muskegon County Board of Commissioners
Hon. Maryann Mahaffey, Councilperson, City of Detroit
James Saari, Director, Western Upper Peninsula Manpower Consortium
GENERAL INFORMATION

Location - The Kellogg Center for Continuing Education on Harrison Road at Michigan Avenue, on the campus of Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan. The Center is readily accessible from all expressways via US-127 and I-496. Travelers should exit on Trowbridge Road and, as it ends, turn left on Harrison Road to the gated parking lot adjacent to the Center.

Both East Lansing's bus station and the regional Amtrak station are within about a half-mile of the Center. Taxis serve between the Center and the Capitol City Airport (served by North Central and United Airlines).

Registration - Please complete and return the enclosed Invitation Acceptance card as soon as possible to assure preparation of conference materials in your name. Upon arrival at the conference, please check in at the registration desk to pick up your name badge and conference materials.

Parking - Adequate pay parking is available adjacent to the Kellogg Center; overflow parking is available at Harrison Road and Kalamazoo Street, one-half block from the Kellogg Center. The parking fee is 25¢ upon exiting.

Housing - Accommodations are available at the Kellogg Center. Rates: Single $16, Twin $10 per person. Please contact the Kellogg Center directly if you desire overnight accommodations, mentioning the name of the program, the type of accommodations you desire, and your approximate arrival and departure times. Kellogg Center for Continuing Education, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI 48824. Requests for accommodations should be received at least two weeks prior to the program if possible.

For further information - The University of Michigan Extension Service, Department of Conferences and Institutes, 412 Maynard Street, Ann Arbor, MI 48109; Telephone (313) 764-5304.

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
THE MANPOWER LEADERSHIP EDUCATION PROJECT

The Manpower Leadership Education Project at The University of Michigan consists of two components. The first component, a graduate degree credit program, was launched in September 1975. Twenty manpower practitioners from throughout the state are currently enrolled in the program. The second component, a series of three state-wide conferences on manpower, is intended to provide public officials and community leaders with an expanded understanding of CETA and the need for meeting Michigan's unemployment crisis.

CONFERENCE I

The first of the three seminars, entitled "Employment, Unemployment, and Education," was held on The University of Michigan campus in Ann Arbor on November 15, 1975. Professor William Haber delivered a major address relating to the economic outlook and its implications for manpower planning in Michigan. A panel comprised of locally elected officials and CETA prime sponsor directors reacted to the presentation—focusing and redefining issues and problems related to administering manpower programs during a period of financial exigency. Over fifty of Michigan's key persons in the fields of manpower and occupational education attended.

CONFERENCE II - "CETA: MANPOWER PLANNING, PROGRAMMING, AND THE PRIME SPONSOR"

LOCATION: Room 101, Kellogg Center, Michigan State University, East Lansing

DATE: January 17, 1976

TIME: 9:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m.

TOPICS:
- Federal, State and Local Roles
- Regulations and Interpretations
- Definitions and Procedures
- Legal Authority of the Prime Sponsor
- Technical Assistance Support
- Monitoring and Reporting
- The Future of Manpower Legislation

SPEAKERS:
Donald Baker, Staff, Committee on Education and Labor, Washington, D.C.
Richard C. Gilliland, Regional Administrator, Employment and Training, Region V, Chicago
Robert Pendleton, Deputy Director, Michigan Bureau of Manpower

CONFERENCE III - "IS CETA ENOUGH?"

The third conference, to be held on March 6, 1976 in the Engineering Society of Detroit Theater, located in the Rackham Building in Detroit, will focus upon the future directions of manpower and occupational education legislation and funding.

The conference theme, "Is CETA Enough?" will be addressed by United States Representatives:

The Honorable Augustus Hawkins, Democrat, California
The Honorable Albert H. Quie, Republican, Minnesota

The two congressmen, both extensively involved in molding legislation for manpower and occupational education, will discuss the prevailing mood of congress toward existing and additional manpower related legislation.

REGISTRATION FOR THE JANUARY 17, 1976 CONFERENCE

There is no registration fee for the January 17 conference. Please complete the attached registration form and return it before January 9 to:
The University of Michigan Extension Service
Conferences and Institutes
350 S. Thayer
Ann Arbor, MI 48109
This conference is sponsored by the

MANPOWER LEADERSHIP EDUCATION PROJECT
School of Education
The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor

For further information, contact:
The University of Michigan Extension Service
Address: 350 So. Thayer, Ann Arbor 48109
Phone: (313) 764-5304

LOCATION OF CONFERENCE

The Helen De Roy Auditorium is located on the campus of Wayne State University in Detroit, Michigan. The auditorium is directly behind the Prentis Building on the west side of Cass Avenue between W. Warren and Kirby.

Associate Coordinator MLEP: J. MICHAEL ERWIN
Special Conference Coordinator: FRANCES NORRIS

HURON PRESS

MANPOWER LEADERSHIP EDUCATION PROJECT
The University of Michigan School of Education

AT
HELEN DE ROY AUDITORIUM
WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY CAMPUS
SAT., MARCH 6
ABOUT THIS CONFERENCE

The goal of federal manpower and occupational education legislation is directed toward maximizing job opportunities and economic security for all Americans willing and able to work. Our nation’s leaders, the Congress and political candidates in this election year are already advancing a variety of programs to stem the tide of unemployment and revitalize the country’s economy.

These programs will have particular significance for the Detroit metropolitan area and the state of Michigan which have been acutely affected by problems of unemployment and recession.

The Manpower Leadership Education Project of The University of Michigan School of Education is sponsoring this invitational conference on the campus of Wayne State University. It is intended to provide an opportunity for elected officials, manpower and vocational advisory committees, agencies, educators, community organizations, business and labor representatives to discuss these problems with Congressmen Hawkins and Quie.

Congressman Hawkins is a co-sponsor with Senator Humphrey of the widely discussed Equal Opportunity and Full Employment Bill. Congressman Quie is one of the leading advocates and sponsors of meaningful occupational education and training legislation in Congress.

Your conference admission card is enclosed. We are also enclosing several extra cards which may be given to associates who share your interest in this conference.

For additional cards or further information please call The University of Michigan Extension Service: (313) 764-5301, Ann Arbor.

A SPECIAL INVITATION
TO DISCUSS

THE ROAD TO FULL EMPLOYMENT
IS CETA ENOUGH?

WITH

U.S. REPRESENTATIVES

HON. AUGUSTUS HAWKINS
Democrat, California

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE
Republican, Minnesota

SATURDAY, MARCH 6, 1976

HELEN DE ROY AUDITORIUM (Lower)

WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY

COFFEE RECEPTION 9:00 am

CONFERENCE 9:30 am – 12:30 pm

WELCOME:

RONALD W. HAUGHTON
Vice-President of Urban Affairs
Wayne State University

MODERATOR:

DR. DANIEL E. VOGLER
Prof. of Occupational Education Project Director, MLEP
University of Michigan

PROJECT COORDINATOR, MLEP
Joseph V. Tuala, Director
Manpower Education Programs
Inst. of Labor & Ind. Relations
University of Michigan – Wayne State University
MANPOWER LEADERSHIP EDUCATION PROJECT

CONFERENCE SERIES

EVALUATION REPORT

Mike Erwin
April 26, 1976
The Questionnaires

Questionnaires were prepared for mailing to two groups of people. The first group, comprised of the 53 people who attended at least two of the three conferences, was sent a questionnaire (Questionnaire 1) requesting the following information: (1) position, (2) evaluation of conferences for six criteria areas, (3) reasons for not attending a conference, (4) interest in the ten conference topics suggested by persons attending the January 17 conference, (5) preferences for changes in the conference format, (6) preferences for conference locations, and (7) additional comments or suggestions.

The second group of people to whom questionnaires were mailed is comprised of 27 locally elected officials and CETA directors who did not attend any conferences. The questionnaire (Questionnaire 2) mailed to this group of people was identical to the questionnaire discussed above except for the omission of item 2, evaluation of conferences for six criteria areas. (Copies of both questionnaires are included in the appendix to this report.)

By April 21, 41 of the 80 questionnaires had been returned. Attendees had a return rate of 58.5 percent while non-attendees had a return rate of 37.0 percent.

The Respondents and Groupings

Respondents to Questionnaire 1 (in descending order of frequency) included: CETA directors, 12; CETA staff, 11; state agency staff, 2; and locally elected official, sub-contractor, federal agency staff, planning council member, Manpower Services Council member, and student, 1 each. In order to analyze the rankings of the respondents by position, three groups will be compared: (1) CETA directors; (2) CETA staff, and (3) Other (the eight respondents in non-director, non-staff persons).

Responding to Questionnaire 2 were 7 directors and 3 elected officials. Where it is useful to do so, the average ratings of this group of ten will be compared to the ratings of one or more of the three groups mentioned in the preceding paragraph.

Due to the low number of responses from elected officials, just four for the two questionnaires, it could be misleading to compute their ratings. Therefore, information on the opinions of an important group are missing from this report.
Ratings of the Three Saturday Conferences

Respondents to Questionnaire 1 were asked to rank each conference they attended on a scale of 5 (excellent) to 1 (poor) for each of six criteria areas. Twenty people provided ratings for the November conference, 30 for the January conference and 25 for the March conference. Shown below are their average rating for the six criteria areas for each of the three Saturday conferences for the series as a whole, and the mathematical scale for interpreting the mean ratings.

Scale: 1.00 - 1.79 - Poor
1.80 - 2.59 - Fair
2.60 - 3.39 - Good
3.40 - 4.19 - Very Good
4.20 - 5.00 - Excellent

CRITERIA AREAS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>November Conference</th>
<th>January Conference</th>
<th>March Conference</th>
<th>Overall Scores Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Choice of conference topic</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>3.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Choice of speaker(s)</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>3.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Choice of location</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Opportunity for participant interaction with speaker</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Opportunity for interaction with other participants</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Overall value of the conference</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Included in the Appendix to this report are tables comparing the responses of directors, staff, and others for each of the six criteria areas for each of the three conferences. Those tables show considerably varied ratings among groups of participants. Some sense of the variance can be gained more readily by examining the overall series ratings shown below.

Scale: 1.00 - 1.79 - Poor
1.80 - 2.59 - Fair
2.60 - 3.39 - Good
3.40 - 4.19 - Very Good
4.20 - 5.00 - Excellent
SERIES RATING FOR EACH CRITERIA AREA:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Directors</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Choice of conference topic</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>3.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Choice of speaker(s)</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>4.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Choice of location</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>4.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Opportunity for participant interaction with speaker</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Opportunity for interaction with other participants</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Overall value of the conference</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It should be noted that for each of the six criteria areas, Staff ratings were lower than those given by Directors and Others. Staff ratings for criteria areas a, e, and f are especially low when compared to the ratings of the other two groups.

Reasons for Not Attending

Persons who attended two conferences were asked why they did not attend the third. Similarly, persons who did not attend any conference were asked their reasons. There was little difference between the reasons of the two groups for not attending. Ten of the 23 people responding to the question saw the conference date as "inconvenient," and five saw the conference locations as either too far away or generally "inconvenient." The remaining reasons varied from snowstorms and vacation to lack of knowledge that the conference was being held (on the part of two staff members).

Topics for Future Conferences

Nearly twenty different topics for future conferences were suggested by persons attending the January 17, 1976 conference in Lansing. Topics mentioned by three or more persons were listed on both Questionnaires 1 and 2. Attendees and non-attendees were asked to check each topic according to whether they had "little or no interest in the topic," "moderate interest," or "strong interest."

For the purposes of comparing preferences for each of the topics listed below, the following scale should be used:
Scale:  

1.00 - 1.66  - Little or No Interest  
1.67 - 2.33  - Moderate Interest  
2.33 - 3.00  - Strong Interest  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOPICS:</th>
<th>Directors</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>&quot;Others&quot;</th>
<th>Non-Attendees</th>
<th>All Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. innovative programs</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. program evaluation and</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>monitoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. budgeting and fiscal procedures</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. improving staff-elected official</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>communication and relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. future federal legislation</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. labor market analysis and</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>2.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. stimulating potential employer's support</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>2.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for CETA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. interagency coordination of manpower</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. career counseling and</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Michigan's economic climate</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>2.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While ratings for the suggested topics appear quite high overall, the fact that the topics were originally suggested by conference participants probably explains the ratings. Only three of the ten topics, budgeting and fiscal procedures, improving staff-elected official relationships, and career counseling and development hold less than a strong interest for respondents.

Changes in Conference Format

Respondents were asked to indicate whether they would be more or less likely to attend next year's conferences if changes in the conference format were made. Shown below are the percentages of persons more likely to attend the conference if certain changes are made.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent More Likely to Attend</th>
<th>1975-76 Attendees</th>
<th>Non-Attendees</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. held on weekdays</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>72.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. oriented more toward providing specific technical skills and information than toward providing current information on issues and problems in manpower</td>
<td>67.9</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>69.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. day-long conferences rather than half-day conferences</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>60.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. comprised of several small, topic oriented discussion groups rather than one large, lecture-discussion group</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Locations for Next Year's Conferences

Respondents were asked to indicate whether they would be likely or unlikely to attend a conference held in different cities in the State. Eleven cities in the upper and lower peninsulas were suggested. Shown below are the percentage of persons indicating that they would be likely to attend.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent Likely to Attend</th>
<th>1975-76 Attendees</th>
<th>Non-Attendees</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Alpena</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Ann Arbor</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>77.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Bay City - Saginaw</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Detroit</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>67.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Escanaba</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Flint</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>55.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Grand Rapids</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>57.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Jackson</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>57.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Kalamazoo</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>51.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Lansing</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Traverse City</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The figures above suggest that the best location for a conference is Lansing followed at some distance by Ann Arbor and Detroit. The figures also suggest that no matter where the conferences are held next year, the persons who did not attend this year are relatively less likely to attend next year.
### November Conference

**Criteria Areas:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Directors</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Choice of conference topic</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Choice of speaker(s)</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Choice of location</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Opportunity for participant interaction with speaker</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Opportunity for interaction with other participants</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Overall value of the conference</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### January Conference

**Criteria Areas:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Directors</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Choice of conference topic</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Choice of speaker(s)</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Choice of location</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Opportunity for participant interaction with speaker</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Opportunity for interaction with other participants</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Overall value of the conference</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
March Conference

Criteria Areas:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Directors</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Choice of conference topic</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Choice of speaker(s)</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Choice of location</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Opportunity for participant interaction with speaker</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Opportunity for interaction with other participants</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Overall value of the conference</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please respond to each of the following questions candidly. Responses will be reported in the aggregate and will greatly assist us in planning future conferences.

1. Your position:
   ______ locally elected public official
   ______ CETA director
   ______ CETA staff
   ______ sub-contractor
   ______ state agency staff
   ______ university faculty
   ______ other (please specify)

2. Please check the conferences you attended.
   ______ November 17 conference in Ann Arbor
   ______ January 16 conference in East Lansing
   ______ March 6 conference in Detroit

3. Using the rating scale below, please record your reaction to each criteria area for the conferences you attended:

   RATING SCALE: 5-excellent; 4-very good; 3-good; 2-fair; 1-poor.

   CRITERIA AREAS:
   a. Choice of conference topic
   b. Choice of speaker(s)
   c. Choice of location
   d. Opportunity for participant interaction with speaker
   e. Opportunity for interaction with other participants
   f. Overall value of the conference

   November Conference | January Conference | March Conference
   ___________________ | ___________________ | ___________________
4. Please complete this item only if you did not attend one of the three conferences. Please check the statement below which most nearly describes your main reason for not attending.

- [ ] was unaware the conference was being held
- [ ] conference location was too far away
- [ ] conference was held at an inconvenient time
- [ ] conference topic was not of sufficient interest
- [ ] conference speaker(s) was not on a par with speakers at other conferences
- [ ] earlier MLEP conferences were of insufficient value to warrant attending
- [ ] other (please explain) 


5. The following topics were among those most often suggested by persons attending the January 17, 1976 conference for use in future conferences. Please indicate your interest in each topic.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Little or No Interest</th>
<th>Moderate Interest</th>
<th>Strong Interest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. innovative programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. program evaluation and monitoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. budgeting and fiscal procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. improving staff-elected official communication and relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. future federal legislation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. labor market analysis and planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. stimulating potential employer's support for CETA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. interagency coordination of manpower programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. career counseling and development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Michigan's economic climate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Would you be more or less likely to attend next year's conferences if they were to be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>More Likely to Attend</th>
<th>Less Likely to Attend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. held on weekdays</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. day-long conferences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. comprised of several</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>small, topic oriented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discussion groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. oriented more toward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>providing specific</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>technical skills and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>information than</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>toward providing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>current information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on issues and problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in manpower</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. This year's conference sites were chosen on the basis of their convenience for large numbers of people. We would like to consider additional areas as conference locations. Please indicate how likely it would be that you would attend a conference in the following locations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas</th>
<th>Likely to Attend</th>
<th>Unlikely to Attend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Alpena</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Ann Arbor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Bay City-Saginaw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Detroit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Escanaba</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Flint</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Grand Rapids</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Jackson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Kalamazoo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Lansing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Traverse City</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. In the space below, please provide any additional observations and/or suggestions you may have regarding the conference series. (Please use the back of this sheet if you need additional room.)

___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
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Please respond to each of the questions candidly. Responses will be reported in the aggregate and will greatly assist us in planning future conferences.

1. Your position:
   - [ ] locally elected public official
   - [ ] CETA director

2. Please check the statement below which most nearly describes your main reason for not attending any of the MLEP conferences.
   - [ ] was unaware the conferences were being held
   - [ ] conferences were held at inconvenient times
   - [ ] conference locations were too far away
   - [ ] conferences were held at inconvenient locations
   - [ ] conference topics were not of sufficient interest
   - [ ] conference speakers seemed unlikely to have much of value to say
   - [ ] other (please explain)

3. The following topics were among those most often suggested by persons attending the January 17, 1976 conference for use in future conferences. Please indicate your interest in each topic.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Little or No Interest</th>
<th>Moderate Interest</th>
<th>Strong Interest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. innovative programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. program evaluation and monitoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. budgeting and fiscal procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. improving staff-elected official communication and relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. future federal legislation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. labor market analysis and planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. (cont'd)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>g. stimulating potential employer's support for CETA</th>
<th>Little or No Interest</th>
<th>Moderate Interest</th>
<th>Strong Interest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>h. interagency coordination of manpower programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. career counseling and development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Michigan's economic climate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Would you be more or less likely to attend next year's conferences if they were to be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>More Likely to Attend</th>
<th>Less Likely to Attend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. held on weekdays</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. day-long conferences rather than half-day conferences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. comprised of several small, topic oriented discussion groups rather than one large, lecture-discussion group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. oriented more toward providing specific technical skills and information than toward providing current information on issues and problems in manpower</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. This year's conference sites were chosen on the basis of their convenience for large numbers of people. We would like to consider additional areas as conference locations. Please indicate how likely it would be that you would attend a conference in the following locations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas</th>
<th>Likely to Attend</th>
<th>Unlikely to Attend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Alpena</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Ann Arbor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Bay City-Saginaw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Detroit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. (cont'd)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas</th>
<th>Likely to Attend</th>
<th>Unlikely to Attend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e. Escanaba</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Flint</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Grand Rapids</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Jackson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Kalamazoo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Lansing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Traverse City</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. In the space below, please provide any additional observations and/or suggestions you may have regarding the conference series.

________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
The MLP Conference Advisory Committee convened on April 29 for the purposes of (1) evaluating the 1975-76 conference series and (2) making recommendations related to the 1976-77 series. Following a report on an evaluation questionnaire sent to conference participants and non-participants, the Committee discussed the different ways in which the 1975-76 series exceeded, met or fell short of their expectations. Rather than providing a narrative of that discussion, this report incorporates those comments into the Committee's recommendations for the 1976-77 series where they seem most appropriate.

Recommendations of the Committee

Background Discussion: Two separate series of conferences should be sponsored by MLEP.

The first series would address the specific role and functions of participant groups. The second would more closely resemble the 1975-76 series in that it would attempt to provide information on current and impending developments in the manpower field.

Recommendation 1: The first series should consist of four conferences to be held at the same location during a period not to exceed eight weeks and should involve (1) locally elected officials, (2) local planning council members, and (3) CETA directors and their staff.

The first conference should be for elected officials only.
and should take place at an attractive location, preferably near Lansing. In order to further encourage attendance, MLP should inform officials that the program will pay for all conference related expenses should the officials so wish. The conference should last between a day and one-half and should allow free time in the evening for informal discussions among officials.

The second conference should be identical in format to the first but should involve local planning council members only. Once again, the expenses of participants should be subsidized where necessary.

The third conference, to be held on a weekday, should involve CETA directors and their staff. The committee felt that subsidizing the attendance of this group is less important than holding the conference on a weekday.

Since each of the first three conferences would be aimed at assisting participants in arriving at a better understanding of their own role in CETA vis-à-vis the roles of others, feedback from earlier conferences would be provided at the second, third, and especially, the fourth conference. The latter would involve all three groups of participants in the earlier conferences and would be aimed at an inter-group sharing of knowledge, techniques, concerns, and problems. This fourth conference would be a one-day conference lasting from 4 1/2 to 5 1/2 hours.

Recommendation 2: The third series of conferences should con-
sist of one or more conferences open to all members of the CETA community.

The primary emphasis of this series should be upon providing a conceptual orientation to manpower problems. Like the 1975-76 series, speakers should be chosen from among the state's leading academicians and national authorities. Topics discussed may or may not include those identified in the evaluation questionnaire. Locations suggested for the conferences were Ann Arbor and Lansing.

Recommendation 3: An attempt should be made to coordinate MLP's efforts in the area of providing what could be considered technical assistance with the efforts of other groups in the state.

In addition to avoiding unnecessary duplication of efforts, the Committee felt that better communication and coordination with such groups would result in earning their cooperation for and endorsement of MLP conferences.

Recommendation 4: The Conference Advisory Committee should be expanded so as to include representatives of all members of the CETA community. At present, membership on the Committee is limited to directors.

The Committee suggested that directors, elected officials, and planning council members participate on a continuing basis in the planning and evaluation of the two 1975-76 conference series. Project staff support will be provided.
APPENDIX H

THIRD-PARTY EVALUATION REPORT
I. Scope of the Inquiry

This report is based on examination of MLP materials (including student evaluations) submitted to the evaluation team by Dan Vogler; interviews with students; interviews with faculty and instructors in MLP; and interviews with employers of students in the program. The evaluation team conducted these interviews separately and met before and after the interviews to coordinate the approach and to consolidate their findings. The evaluation team wishes to acknowledge the unflinching cooperation of the MLP staff, students, and employers in furthering the evaluation effort.

II. Goals of the Project

In general, the evaluation team feels that a Master's degree program organized in the manner of MLP is an appropriate model for training staff in the manpower field. The emphasis on leadership in manpower programs is appropriate because of the crucial need for the development of expertise and administrative skills in the conduct of employment and training programs at the state and local levels under the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act. The leadership model, including the award of a Master's degree, is particularly valid for upward-mobile staff in manpower programs for whom such a degree may open doors that would be otherwise closed to them. Under the MLP established in the first year, "leadership" has been defined broadly to include first-line supervision and those who take a leading role in job development and counselling activities. This broad definition of "leadership," however, calls for special attention to the selection of students for the program and for the organization of instruction and curriculum content. These issues are discussed in more detail below.
The program design offers a good base for the development and testing of manpower program concepts as well as leadership skills. It allows for depth of instruction in a number of important subject-matter areas, and it provides a procedure for trainee accountability as well as rewards for the trainee.

The MLP approach in involving active practitioners in the instructional program, working in close relationship with academicians, offers the greatest potential for the development of leadership skills in the manpower field. This combination helps to assure that the program will be relevant and up-to-date and yet rooted in sound theories and principles.

III. Accomplishments

It is the general conclusion of the evaluation team that the organization and operation of MLP represents a significant accomplishment. MLP in its first year has met all of its operational objectives, has assembled a talented and dedicated staff, and has established a firm basis for further development of the program.

The suggestions for reorientation of the program contained in this report are not intended to detract from MLP's worthy accomplishments in the first year.

IV. Problems Arising from the Diversity of Students

The program was not completely successful in meeting student and prime sponsor needs, partly because the student body had such diverse backgrounds and goals. It was difficult for individual instructors and for the program as a whole to gear course content and instructional level to the needs of the entire student group. The first-year students included directors, high-level technicians, middle-level management, per-
sons involved in lower-level operating functions, and some service-
delivery personnel. It was inevitable that to attempt to conduct an edu-
cational and training program for students at these diverse levels would
lead to some student dissatisfaction.

The directors generally felt that much of the instruction and pro-
gram materials were not useful at their level of program administration.
Many below the directors level felt that the program was beneficial, but
there were several who expressed the view that the program was too theory-
oriented and that it had insufficient applicability to the real world of
employment and training. And yet, a few of the students appeared to be
more interested in the academic aspects of the program than in the prac-
tical application to manpower administration.

Several of the members of the staff also felt that the diversity of
the student body created some special instructional problems. They noted
that they felt constrained at times by the limited knowledge and interests
of some of the student body.

The program appears to have had its greatest impact on improving the
skills and job performance of middle-management in manpower programs. It
is for this group that the academic perspective appears to be most mean-
gful and for whom prime sponsors appear to see their greatest training
needs. As noted in the final section of this report, it is our suggestion
that greater emphasis be given to the inclusion of the middle-management
group among the student body and a consequent concentration on curricular
materials designed for this group. The potential opening of higher career
opportunities for middle-management would also be fully in keeping with
the "leadership" concept of the program. It would permit greater consis-
tency in the level of instruction and in curriculum content.
Although we are not prepared to suggest that directors or lower-level personnel be excluded from the program, we are cognizant of the special problems created in the first year by inclusion in these groups. If they are to be included in the future, some special steps must be taken to meet their needs as suggested in the final section below.

V. Views of Students

The student evaluations of instructors were generally favorable and, in some cases, glowing. However, as noted above, their diversity in background, experience, and goals led inevitably to criticisms of some instructors and some courses. Where some found the program too theoretical, others complained that it provided little information that was helpful, and others urged that there be greater concentration on the practical day-to-day administrative and political problems of manpower program administration.

A number of the students were also critical of the time schedule and the time burden placed upon them by MLP. The evaluation team did not feel that the burden of work was excessive for a Master's program. However, it is natural that some of the students may have felt that the program was too time consuming because it was added to their full-time job. This problem can best be met by advance instruction as to the requirements of an academic Master's degree. The evaluation team feels that there should be no reduction in the total time or work load required for completion of the program. Some students also felt that advance instruction or orientation was needed for their employers. They were concerned that their employers did not appear to give full support to their participation in MLP and did not appear to understand the time requirements of the program.
In spite of the views, it should be noted that when the students were asked the question, "Would you recommend this program to a close friend who had a position similar to yours?", the answer was overwhelmingly "Yes". Thus, the reservations and qualifications concerned specifics rather than the thrust of the program as a whole.

VI. Views of the Students' Employers

The students' employers expressed opinions about the program which partly reflected those of the students. Their basic criticism was that the program material was too theory-oriented and lacked sufficient applicability to the day-to-day problems of program administration. Some felt that the program was too time consuming and interfered with the student's regular activities in their agency. Many of the employers clearly would have preferred a leadership education program that focused more on practical problem solving in the areas of manpower planning, evaluation, and administration. These expectations may have been unrealistic and may reflect an unawareness of the broader goals of MLP. On the other hand, as noted in the following section, some of these views may have stemmed from some real deficiencies in instruction and content.

VII. Project Staff

The view of some students and their employers that the program lacked sufficient practical applicability may have been due, in part, to an initial lack of understanding of CETA operations by some program staff. Some of the initial instruction and course outlines reflected more of the experience of the 1960's than the CETA era of the 1970's. Students sometimes complained that the lecturers had to be "brought up to date on CETA." Many of these problems probably resulted from the fact that this...
was the first year of the program and that the program was instituted quickly. Although some staff members may not have been conversant with current manpower program operations at the beginning of MLP, field experience, input from students, and contact with current performance brought them up to date. Their second year should be much more effective on this score. The practical limitations of academic personnel were offset, to a considerable extent, by the use of outside sources. These resource personnel helped to fill in such areas as the political context of manpower programs, legislative dynamics and issues, mobilization of community resources, and the influencing of public opinion by manpower administrators. While such "practical" input is essential in the MLP model, an intensive leadership course for practitioners also requires a sound academic base, albeit a base that is congruent with practical applications.

VIII. The Mix of Courses and Seminars

The evaluation team feels that the program structure in terms of the mix of courses, maxi and mini seminars, externships, and individual study is ideally designed to achieve the objectives of MLP. This mixture calls for varying types of student input and participation, all of which contribute to the achievement of the program's goals. Although there were some student and employer criticisms of the externships and the time schedule, there is no reason to believe that the basic structure and mixture of instructional inputs were at fault.

IX. Courses and Course Content

The courses established in the program appear to the evaluation team to provide the correct topics for a Master's program in manpower leadership. However, the views of students, student-employers, and our-own
analysis of the curricula reveal some areas for improvement. Each of
the core courses is discussed in terms of this evaluation information:

Theories of Administrative Organization--While a "process" course is
appropriate for the MLP, the perspectives of the existing course should
be broadened to include the external organizational relationships that
comprise the CETA environment, including the labor market. If possible,
the course should attempt to be less theoretical, perhaps through the
use of case studies. It may be that a business administration perspective
could provide a more appropriate course;

Labor Market Information--While the course outline appears too de-
tailed and technical for a manpower leadership program, the instructor
apparently was very successful in making adjustments during the course.
The Labor Market Information course has its greatest impact on students
insofar as it is able to tie in labor market analysis with program objec-
tives and important manpower issues;

Human Resource Programs--The course outline is appropriate. A few
participants commented that for some topics the relevance to CETA was not
sufficiently explained. Perhaps the coordination of Vocational Education,
Vocational Rehabilitation, and HEW manpower programs should be included
in this course;

Environmental Information--This course is perhaps too narrowly fo-
cused for the MLP. A content course on management functions such as
planning, evaluation, budgeting systems, monitoring, management informa-
tion systems, etc., might make better use of this course slot.

The seminars also appear to have the correct blending of topics.

However, the project staff would do well to consider some broadening of these
topics in the second year, perhaps utilizing the topics included in the
Harvard Institute in Employment and Training Administration.
X. Institutional Effects

In addition to the obvious effects on students and staff, several institutional effects can be observed. Administrators and some staff members in three Schools and an Institute know much more about CETA and about each other's work than before. This cooperation should improve the quality of instruction in a wide variety of courses and programs. This program is also responsible for re-opening the dormant question of the desirability of giving degree-granting authority to ILIR.

XI. Suggestions

In addition to the suggestions included in the sections above, the following should be considered by the MLP staff:

A. Administrative Home

There appeared to be some general agreement among those questioned by the evaluation team that a logical home for MLP would be the Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations. However, ILIR has no degree-granting authority, and in the meantime, the School of Education appears to be its most logical base. The existence of the MLP program might well serve as a starting point in achieving a degree-granting authority for ILIR.

B. The Student Body

A more homogeneous student body should be sought for the program in the second year. The program might attempt to concentrate on persons in middle-management positions; and the concept of leadership would be consistent with the up-grading of such participants in their jobs and in the management hierarchy. Although we did not go so far as to recommend the exclusion of directors or of persons in technical or service delivery functions, these groups should be discouraged from enrolling unless two conditions are met: they should be made aware well in advance of their
enrollment of the principal focus of MLP on middle management; and if such persons as directors are included in any substantial number, special provision should be made for them through seminars specifically designed to meet their needs. Separate training of directors through mini seminars would not only provide specialized information for them, but it would also be more attractive because it would require less of their time. Employers who participated in these sessions during the first year generally considered them to be interesting and valuable. At the same time, an emphasis on middle-management job performance would allow instructors and course content to emphasize actual prime sponsor problems and it would permit substantial political and other environmental subject matter required in a course in manpower leadership development. In other words, although we do not wish to restrict the definition of the term "leadership", it could well focus on those who wish to improve their present middle-leadership position or who aspire to reach the top.

C. Scheduling

In order to meet the student complaint that it was difficult to keep up course work and office duties at the same time, MLP staff might consider the following possible scheduling changes: a stretching out of the program to two years; a spacing out of the intensive course work periods to permit students to get away from their jobs and yet allow a sufficient "sink-in" period between instructional phases; and the adoption of a "week-end college" system to reduce week-long intensive course work.

D. Geographic Dispersion

Related to scheduling problems, consideration should be given to week-end sessions held in different parts of the state in order to equalize student travel time and encourage enrollment by those distant from Ann Arbor.
E. Limitation on Enrollment

There is some evidence that enrollment of more than one person from a prime sponsor's staff has led to detrimental competition between staff members, increased loss of total staff time, and may inhibit frankness of discussion in courses and seminars. If limitations on total enrollment are necessary, consideration should be given to the limiting of enrollment to only one person from a prime sponsor's staff.

F. Orientation Program for Students' Employers

Prime sponsors should receive greater information prior to initiation of the program concerning its objectives and the amount of time which will be required of students away from their regular office duties.

G. Student Counselling

Students should be assisted in academic planning in the period following MLP, especially the procedures in obtaining the additional 10 credits needed for their Master's degree.

Samuel Bernstein
Rupert Evans
Gerald Somers
involve all three groups of participants in the earlier conferences and would be aimed at an inter-group sharing of knowledge, techniques, concerns, and problems. This fourth conference would be a one-day conference lasting from 4 1/2 to 5 1/2 hours.

Recommendation 2: The third series of conferences should con-
CETA community. At present, membership on the Committee is limited to directors.

The Committee suggested that directors, elected officials, and planning council members participate on a continuing basis in the planning and evaluation of the two 1975-76 conference series. Project staff support will be provided.
manpower programs for whom such a degree may open doors that would be otherwise closed to them. Under the MLP established in the first year, "leadership" has been defined broadly to include first-line supervision and those who take a leading role in job development and counselling activities. This broad definition of "leadership," however, calls for special attention to the selection of students for the program and for the organization of instruction and curriculum content. These issues are discussed in more detail below.
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needs. As noted in the final section of this report, it is our suggestion that greater emphasis be given to the inclusion of the middle-management group among the student body and a consequent concentration on curricular materials designed for this group. The potential opening of higher career opportunities for middle-management would also be fully in keeping with the "leadership" concept of the program. It would permit greater consistency in the level of instruction and in curriculum content.
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there is no reason to believe that the basic structure and mixture of instructional inputs were at fault.
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Environmental Information--This course is perhaps too narrowly focused for the MLP. A content course on management functions such as planning, evaluation, budgeting systems, monitoring, management information systems, etc., might make better use of this course slot.
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