
Drawing upon a database of state-administered vocational education program improvement projects, a study examined state-administered programs to improve vocational education that were implemented from fiscal 1978 through fiscal 1982. After analyzing abstracts of 3,994 research, exemplary and innovative, and curriculum development activities, researchers drew the following conclusions:

1. States seem to place a lower priority on research, exemplary and innovative, and curriculum development activities than on vocational guidance and counseling, personnel training, and sex equity.
2. Public educational agencies and institutions play a dominant role in program improvement activities.
3. States show a heavy concern for assisting practicing teachers and a relatively small concern for teacher education programs.
4. State funding for distributing materials have increased annually.
5. The greatest program improvement effort has focused on improvement of instruction in local vocational education programs.

Based on these findings, recommendations called for development of more descriptive abstracts for the database from which these findings were drawn, for more research concerning vocational education personnel training, for closer coordination of curriculum development activities across states, and for further research on the allocation of program improvement funds between preservice and inservice educational programs. (MN)
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A 1976 assessment by the Committee for Vocational Education Research and Development (COVERD) was highly critical of the vocational education research and development program because of its apparent lack of impact due to shifting research priorities, geographic restrictions on distribution of research and development funds, lack of coordination between parts, inadequate dissemination and utilization, failure to examine impact, and slow start-up. The Education Amendments of 1976 (P.L. 94-482) responded to many of the concerns raised about vocational education research and development. It provided for Programs of National Significance to be administered at the federal level and Program Improvement and Supportive Services to be administered at the state level.

Vocational Education Program Improvement: An Analysis of State-Administered Projects in FY 1978-1982 summarizes the state-administered research, exemplary and innovative, and curriculum development activities for the last five years. The information reported in this analysis has been generated from the online vocational education program improvement database (known by the acronym RIVE, Resources in Vocational Education) which has wide use and application by persons in federal and state agencies. Information retrieved from the database may be used to report accomplishments to policy makers, monitor expenditures, track products to projects, set priorities, develop cooperative program improvement activities, and avoid duplication of effort.

The analysis was conducted in the Information Systems Division of the National Center under the direction of Joel H. Magisos. Wesley E. Budke, Director of the National Center Clearinghouse, prepared this analysis. Dr. Budke holds a Ph.D. in Agricultural Education from The Ohio State University and has been involved in vocational education information system development and educational product dissemination work at the National Center since 1970. Special recognition is given to project staff members Judith Wagner, Wheeler Richards, Alan Kohan, and Peter Ewang for their help in retrieving and preparing the data.

Critiques of a preliminary draft of the paper were provided by John Washburn, Illinois Department of Adult, Vocational, and Technical Education; Jerry C. Olson, Pennsylvania Department of Education; Edgar Hornback, State Board for Vocational and Technical Education; Earl Russell, University of Illinois-Champaign; Erma Keyes, VEIN; and Daniel Dunham, William Stevenson, Jay Smink, and Shirley Chase from the National Center for Research in Vocational Education. Janet Ray provided word processing assistance, and final editing of the document was provided under the supervision of Janet Kiplinger of the National Center's Editorial Services.
The contribution of all of these individuals to the preparation of this paper is appreciated. The reviewers should, however, in no way be held responsible for the viewpoints presented in this paper. That responsibility rests solely with the author.

The funds for this effort were provided by the Office of Vocational and Adult Education, U.S. Department of Education.

Robert E. Taylor
Executive Director
The National Center for Research in Vocational Education
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Education Amendments of 1976 (P.L. 94-482) provided for Program Improvement and Support Services to be administered at the state level. The Rules and Regulations for the Amendments required the state research coordinating units to submit abstracts of contracted program improvement projects under Section 131 (research), Section 132 (exemplary and innovative), and Section 133 (curriculum development) to the National Center for Research in Vocational Education. To provide a comprehensive record of the state vocational education program improvement activities, an online database (RIVE) was developed. Nearly 4,000 program improvement projects—research, exemplary and innovative, and curriculum development—conducted during FY 1978 through FY 1982 are described in this database.

A total of 3,994 projects and $104,638,145 of obligated funds were reported for the five-year period. This analysis reports the number of projects and the associated obligated funds by fiscal year and legislative section by state, recipient of project funds, target population, project outcomes, and priority or problem area.

The following conclusions about state-administered vocational education program improvement activities were drawn from the data reported:

- The vocational education program improvement database is a useful tool for summarizing and analyzing vocational education research, exemplary and innovative, and curriculum development activity.

- States seem to place a lower priority on research, exemplary and innovative, and curriculum development activities than on vocational guidance and counseling, personnel training, and sex equity.

- States seem to allocate a rather stable portion (18.3 to 20.7 percent) of the federal allocation for program improvement to research, exemplary and innovative, and curriculum development activities.

- States place about equal emphasis on research, exemplary and innovative, and curriculum development activities.

- Curriculum development seems to be perceived by the states to be more important than research and exemplary and innovative activities.

- Public education agencies and institutions played a dominant role in conducting program improvement activities.

- States showed a heavy concern for assisting practicing teachers and a relatively small concern for teacher education programs.
o State-level commitment to dissemination is strong and stable in that the funds obligated for distribution of materials has increased annually.

o The greatest program improvement effort has focused directly on improvement of instruction in local vocational education programs.
The Vocational Education Act of 1963 (P.L. 88-210) was the landmark legislation for vocational education program improvement because it contained broad provisions for research and training, as well as experimental, and demonstration or pilot programs. Funding authorized under the legislation was appropriated by Congress and allocated by the Commissioner of Education for institutional capacity building and for such priorities as program evaluation, resource development, vocational guidance and career choice, organization and administration, and new careers. The subsequent Vocational Education Act of 1968 (P.L. 90-576) authorized support of grants for research, training, exemplary programs, and curriculum development. A part of the research and exemplary programs was to be administered at the state level.

A 1976 assessment by the Committee for Vocational Education Research and Development (COVERD) was highly critical of the vocational education research and development program because of its apparent lack of documented impact due to shifting research priorities, geographic restriction on distribution of research and development funds, lack of coordination between or among parts, inadequate dissemination and utilization, failure to examine impact, and slow start-up. COVERD faulted vocational education research and development for not focusing on the larger philosophical and policy issues during the previous ten-year period.

The Education Amendments of 1978 (P.L. 94-482) responded to many of the concerns raised about vocational education research and development. It provided for Programs of National Significance to be administered at the federal level and for Program Improvement and Support Services to be administered at the state level. The act encouraged consolidation of programs, more responsible management, and specific accountability. The Rules and Regulations for the act required that state research coordinating units submit to the National Center for Research in Vocational Education abstracts of program improvement projects under Section 131 (research), Section 132 (exemplary and innovative), and Section 133 (curriculum development) when contracted, and reports and products resulting from each project within ninety days of its completion.

States were not required to submit abstracts of projects funded under Section 134 (vocational guidance and counseling), Section 135 (vocational education personnel training), and Section 136 (sex equity). These projects receive approximately 80 percent of the program improvement funds.

The legislative intent of research, exemplary and innovative, and curriculum development projects was to emphasize improvement in planned use of available resources for vocational education and manpower training; in extension, improvement, and where necessary, maintenance of existing programs; in development of new programs; in elimination of sex discrimination and sex
stereotyping; and in provision of part-time employment for needy youth. The substance of these three legislative sections on program improvement is presented next.

Section 131: Research. Funds may be used to support state research coordinating units (RCUs) and for contracts to be granted by RCUs for program improvement involving (1) applied research and development projects; (2) experimental, developmental, and pilot programs designed to test the effectiveness of research findings, including programs to overcome problems of sex bias and sex stereotyping; (3) improved curriculum materials for current programs and new materials for new and emerging job fields; (4) development of new careers and occupations in fields such as mental and physical health, crime prevention and correction, welfare, education, municipal services, child care, and recreation; (5) training and development projects designed to demonstrate improved methods of obtaining the cooperation of both public and private sectors the better to coordinate and implement programs for employing persons in the fields described above; (6) evaluation of programs relating to training and using public service aides; and (7) dissemination of contract results locally. Contracts must result in improved teaching techniques, or in curriculum materials that will be used in substantial numbers of classrooms or other learning situations within five years after contract termination.

Section 132: Exemplary and Innovative. Funds may be used for contracts for the support of exemplary and innovative programs. These include (1) developing high-quality vocational education programs for urban centers with high concentrations of economically disadvantaged, unskilled workers, and unemployed individuals; (2) developing training opportunities for persons in sparsely populated rural areas and individuals migrating from farms to urban areas; (3) providing effective vocational education for individuals with limited English-speaking ability; (4) establishing cooperative arrangements between public education and human resource development agencies designed to correlate vocational education opportunities with current and projected labor market needs; (5) broadening occupational aspirations and opportunities for youth (with special emphasis given to youth who have academic, socioeconimic, or other handicaps), including programs and projects designed to familiarize elementary and secondary students with a broad range of occupations for which special skills are required and the requisites for careers in such occupations; and (6) facilitating participation of employers and labor organizations in postsecondary education.

Other provisions of Section 132 give priority to programs designed to reduce sex stereotyping in vocational education and provide for participation of students enrolled in non-profit private schools. Annual program plans and accountability
reports covering the final year of financial support by the state for these programs must indicate what will happen to the program after federal support is discontinued, and how promising programs will be continued and expanded within the state.

Section 133: Curriculum Development. Funds may be used for contracts to support curriculum development projects, including developing and disseminating vocational education curriculum materials for new and changing occupational fields and for individuals with special needs. Funds may be used also for contracts to develop guidance, curriculum and testing materials, and to provide support services designed to overcome sex bias. Contracts must result in improved teaching techniques or curriculum materials that will be used in a substantial number of classrooms or other learning situations within five years after contract termination.

Vocational Education Program Improvement Database

A computerized database, Resources in Vocational Education (RIVE) was developed by the National Center for Research in Vocational Education to organize a comprehensive record of vocational education program improvement activities conducted by the states. RIVE contains the following kinds of information on nearly 4,000 program improvement projects conducted during FY 1978 through FY 1982: the fiscal year, the legislative section number from which the funds were appropriated, the state, the title of the project, the name and address of the project director, the amount of project funds, and an annotation about the project. ERIC descriptors were adopted to facilitate composition and retrieval of this information in abstract form. A sample abstract is displayed in Appendix A. The public was given access to RIVE as a database of the Bibliographic Retrieval Services, Inc. (BRS) on March 1, 1982.

The program improvement database has wide use and application by personnel in federal and state agencies as well as proposers and performers in the vocational and technical education field. Information retrieved from the database may be used to report accomplishments to policymakers, monitor expenditures, track products to projects, set priorities, develop cooperative program improvement activities, and avoid duplication of effort.

Three summaries of data provided by the states on their program improvement projects were prepared by the National Center for Research in Vocational Education and are available through the ERIC system: FY 1978 and FY 1979 (ED 194 768), FY 1980 (ED 198 263), and FY 1981 (ED 215 147). These reports identify each state's projects by type of contracted agency, purpose, and results. Further investigation on qualitative and programmatic dimensions and the impact of these state projects went beyond the scope of the summary reports, but can be facilitated through the database.

This report summarizes five years (FY 1978 through FY 1982) of state program improvement project activity based on the data submitted to the National
Center through FY 1982. Analysis of selected data offers informative response to these kinds of questions:

- How may projects were conducted and how much money was obligated?
- How do states compare in the number of projects conducted and the amount of funds obligated?
- Are projects addressing critical problems and issues?
- What is the relative emphasis on target audiences and problem areas?
- What kinds of agencies and organizations are conducting the work?

Trends in funding, numbers of projects, types of projects, and the population served are tracked to demonstrate usefulness of the data for educational practitioners, researchers, administrators, and policymakers seeking answers to program development and improvement questions and information for policymaking decisions.

The capacity for developing more definitive findings related to the productivity of and potential for vocational program improvement through state administration of federal dollars for contracted projects is enhanced by RIVE. As demonstrated by the report, the RIVE database is a multi-faceted resource for those who deem factual information critical when applying creative talents to substantive issues and inquiries.
METHODOLOGY

The database of state-administered program improvement projects is managed by the National Center Clearinghouse staff. They review and analyze descriptive abstracts provided by state research coordinating units to identify, clarify, and compile project data. This requires the following repeated structured operational sequence:

1. Clearinghouse staff review each abstract for complete bibliographic and funding information. Missing information is requested from the state.

2. They compile a list of projects received from each state and request verification from the state research coordinating unit director.

3. They edit and index project abstracts according to ERIC format.

4. They code and process key variables for the computer file (i.e., organization type, target population, education level, outcomes, priorities).

5. They sort and tabulate data by computer-searching the program improvement database maintained by BRS.

6. They create table displays of aggregate data (See Findings section of this report).
FINDINGS

The findings reported in this section are based upon data drawn from program improvement project abstracts supplied by state research coordinating units. Since they administer the program improvement activities, their review of the project abstract list is considered verification that the data file is complete.

A computer search of the RIVE database was conducted through the Bibliographic Retrieval Services, Inc. (BRS), Latham, New York. The number of contracts and the amount of obligated funds for state-administered program improvement projects were retrieved and summarized by categories:

- Program improvement projects by state
- Program improvement projects by legislative section
- Contract recipients of project funding
- Target populations of state program improvement projects
- Outcomes of projects
- Priority areas addressed by projects.

In a later section of the report, state program improvement projects specifically related to curriculum are discussed.

The information reported about state-administered program improvement projects in the RIVE database is influenced by the following factors:

1. The information was taken from the funded proposals, but does not reflect subsequent cancellations of funding and scope adjustments throughout the life of the project.

2. State departments of vocational education are allowed to carry-over funds to the following year, thus allowing some delayed program improvement activity.

3. The data reported in this summary reflects the program improvement information in the RIVE database as of November 15, 1982.

4. The program improvement activities reported represent only those receiving federal funds under Section 131 (research), Section 132 (exemplary and innovative), and Section 133 (curriculum development) of Subpart 3 of the Education Amendments of 1976.
5. The projects reported have been verified as correct by the research coordinating units.

Federal Allocations to State Program Improvement

State allocation of program improvement funds to Section 131 (research), Section 132 (exemplary and innovative), and Section 133 (curriculum development) is made possible by federal allocation to the states. Table 1 shows these federal allocations for FY 1978 through 1982. Also shown are the amount of these funds allocated by the states (collectively) for research, exemplary and innovative, and curriculum development activities.

During the five years, the portion of federal allocation to these sections showed a maximum of 2.4 percent variation (FY 1978-FY 1980) while total allocation showed a maximum differential of nearly $32 million (FY 1982-FY 1982). In FY 1981, states received the highest total allocation for all program improvement, but a reduced percent of allocation for Sections 131, 132, and 133.

State Funding of Projects

Table 2 summarizes the number of funded vocational education program improvement projects in the categories of research, exemplary and innovative, and curriculum development, as well as the federal funds obligated for these projects in each of the states and territories for FY 1978 through 1982 (July 1, 1977 through June 30, 1982), noteworthy findings include the following:

1. For the five years FY 1978-FY 1982, states and territories reported 3,994 program improvement projects for which $104,638,145 was obligated.

2. The number of projects ranged from zero in two territories to 314 in Pennsylvania. This state also had the largest number of projects (88) in any one year (FY 1980) with an average obligation of $16,571.

3. Obligated funds for projects ranged from zero in two territories to $13,428,148 in Texas.

4. The average funding for projects was $26,199, ranging from $5,227 in the state of Washington to $101,000 in Mississippi.

5. Most states had their peak years of project funding in FY 1980 and FY 1981. This coincided with the peak year of federal allocations (See Table 1).

6. FY 1982 was the lowest funding year with 695 projects and $17,436,444 obligated. This decline represents a 24 percent decrease in the number of projects funded and 29 percent decrease in funding from the FY 1981 peak year.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Total Federal Allocation To States for Subpart 3</th>
<th>State Allocation To Sections 131, 132, &amp; 133</th>
<th>Percent of Total Allocated to Sections 131, 132, &amp; 133</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>103,324,822</td>
<td>18,905,159</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>107,667,991</td>
<td>20,158,728</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>113,662,067</td>
<td>23,514,466</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>126,162,326</td>
<td>24,629,348</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>94,670,070</td>
<td>17,430,444</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>545,488,276</td>
<td>104,638,145</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 2**

**FY 1978–1982 STATE PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>States/States</th>
<th>No. of Projects</th>
<th>FY 1979</th>
<th>No. of Projects</th>
<th>FY 1980</th>
<th>No. of Projects</th>
<th>FY 1981</th>
<th>No. of Projects</th>
<th>FY 1982</th>
<th>No. of Projects</th>
<th>FY 1983</th>
<th>5 Yr Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>87,801</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35,004</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>50,383</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>63,393</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>32,321</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>103,200</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4,426</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Samoa</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>214,176</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>162,000</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>139,494</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>161,744</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>125,374</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>109,281</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>294,573</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>118,240</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>267,378</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2,042,755</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>759,960</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>812,675</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>585,230</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>466,551</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4,148</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>285,538</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>111,320</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>201,315</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>205,246</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>44,109</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>513,796</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>496,058</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>468,662</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19,097</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>41,600</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>219,798</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7,328</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>315,273</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>315,273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>787,256</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>906,853</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>773,854</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1,183,699</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>859,881</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>333,648</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>329,633</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>855,614</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>727,570</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>360,971</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guam</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21,861</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21,861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>41,910</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29,300</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>111,292</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>96,232</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>49,783</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29,500</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1,729,853</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>2,577,673</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>2,627,403</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2,609,516</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1,636,646</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2,119,800</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>558,392</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>845,283</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>982,119</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>896,936</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>273,099</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>443,041</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>639,621</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>106,059</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>365,242</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>153,904</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>161,843</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>214,088</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>396,718</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>274,793</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>333,516</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>96,975</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>406,904</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>1,150,764</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>512,705</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>207,187</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>161,317</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>152,560</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>411,179</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>308,908</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>75,466</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>48,374</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>43,368</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36,600</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>64,955</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>760,632</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>441,754</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>509,990</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>456,300</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>283,764</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>664,542</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>429,425</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1,187,297</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>842,827</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>456,250</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>409,000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>293,335</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>613,331</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>415,156</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>406,161</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>333,380</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>262,290</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>310,000</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>149,895</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>472,580</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>539,911</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>735,836</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>782,443</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>135,368</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>378,820</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>619,332</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>536,582</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33,530</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>160,171</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>138,887</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>42,887</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17,238</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10,240</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>44,371</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>92,275</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>101,039</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18,557</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Information for this analysis was taken from the RIVE database on November 15, 1982. Although this is four and one-half months after the close of FY 1982 program improvement activity, it is possible that a minimal number of projects for FY 1982 were not yet reported.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>No. of Projects</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>No. of Projects</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>No. of Projects</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>No. of Projects</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>No. of Projects</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>34,998</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>220,985</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>95,528</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>271,517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22,826</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>102,646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>536,968</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>288,933</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>553,267</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>927,565</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>665,876</td>
<td>1,832,928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>518,660</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>273,500</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>146,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,031,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1,493,624</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1,394,228</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2,454,231</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1,593,870</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>540,734</td>
<td>7,476,687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24,879</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>157,072</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>181,808</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>87,666</td>
<td>171,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>62,841</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>75,172</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>85,999</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>85,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>356,494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1,126,820</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1,154,842</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1,175,000</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1,158,580</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>766,796</td>
<td>165,932,028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>92,011</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>177,744</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>280,293</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>229,725</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>97,500</td>
<td>521,918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>199,033</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>119,417</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>123,070</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>220,563</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>261,426</td>
<td>923,509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>862,528</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1,102,121</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>1,458,227</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1,533,094</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1,159,035</td>
<td>6,115,005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>94,528</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>94,528</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>62,281</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>161,971</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>144,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>150,313</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>430,010</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>282,190</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>869,816</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1,112,354</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>178,978</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>462,242</td>
<td>2,723,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1,580,274</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>2,827,917</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>3,182,242</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3,010,029</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2,827,686</td>
<td>13,428,168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>144,494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>248,582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virgin Islands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>196,536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>168,422</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1,017,675</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>618,513</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>364,353</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>107,822</td>
<td>2,255,785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>125,930</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>76,780</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>74,103</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>71,772</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>210,712</td>
<td>1,077,297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>338,912</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>248,435</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>146,803</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>122,147</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>77,997</td>
<td>934,294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>300,393</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>482,313</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>338,407</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>816,857</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>347,910</td>
<td>2,285,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>74,080</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>36,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>166,669</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>73,622</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>735</td>
<td>18,905,159</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>20,158,728</td>
<td>845</td>
<td>23,514,466</td>
<td>909</td>
<td>24,629,348</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>17,430,444</td>
<td>3,994,104,638,145</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. Eleven states had an increase in project funding in FY 1982 over FY 1981. Mississippi was the only state that reported an increase in project funding in each fiscal year from 1978 through 1982.

Table 3 shows the number of vocational education program improvement projects and the funds obligated for projects in each of the states and territories under provisions of Section 131 (research), Section 132 (exemplary and innovative), and Section 133 (curriculum development) of P.L. 94-482 during FY 1978 through FY 1982. Two findings are noteworthy:

1. The total number of projects and the amount of funds obligated by states under each legislative section were nearly equal.

2. Four states or territories (District of Columbia, Nevada, Ohio, and Puerto Rico) funded projects under only one legislative section.

Legislative Sections

Table 4 shows the collective state distribution of projects and funds across the program improvement sections (i.e., research, exemplary and innovative, and curriculum development) for FY 1978 through FY 1982. Analysis of Table 4 permits the following observations:

Research (Section 131)

1. The 1,287 projects conducted under this section received $34,089,000 obligated funds, an average of $26,487.

2. The number of projects ranged from 207 in FY 1982 to 283 in FY 1981.

3. The total amount of annual funding ranged from $4,762,046 in FY 1982 to $8,096,368 in FY 1980.

4. The number of projects in FY 1982 decreased by 27 percent from FY 1981 and the amount of obligated funds decreased by 40 percent from FY 1981.

Exemplary and Innovative (Section 132)

1. The 1,365 projects conducted under this section received $33,361,630 obligated funds, an average of $24,441.

2. The number of projects ranged from 225 in FY 1982 to 326 in FY 1981.

3. The total amount of annual funding ranged from $5,841,342 in FY 1982 to $7,333,862 in FY 1981.

4. The number of projects in FY 1982 decreased by 31 percent from FY 1981 and the amount of obligated funds decreased by 20 percent from FY 1981.
TABLE 3
FY 1978–1982 PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT PROJECT FUNDING BY STATE AND LEGISLATIVE SECTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>SECTION 131</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>SECTION 132</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>SECTION 133</th>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of Projects</td>
<td>Amt. of Funding</td>
<td>No. of Projects</td>
<td>Amt. of Funding</td>
<td>No. of Projects</td>
<td>Amt. of Funding</td>
<td>No. of Projects</td>
<td>Amt. of Funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>162,188</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>61,000</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>223,188</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>300,400</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>666,414</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Samoa</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,307,716</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>610,354</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>4,667,171</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>222,261</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>206,095</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>612,661</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>444,468</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>657,858</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>2,272,784</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1,749,101</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1,749,101</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>5,202,730</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>306,933</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>220,728</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1,015,755</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>910,825</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>383,543</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>1,727,869</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>225,798</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>45,328</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>293,823</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>315,273</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>315,273</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>372,521</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1,760,563</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>4,511,543</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>17,500</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1,156,026</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>2,607,540</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guam</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,159</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>197,020</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21,861</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25,410</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16,500</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>71,210</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>223,668</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25,967</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>301,807</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>1,628,829</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2,522,784</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>11,181,091</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>1,413,096</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1,444,214</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>5,202,730</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>509,795</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3,152,164</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1,627,062</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>395,727</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>428,195</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>1,201,346</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1,517,653</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2,522,710</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>2,500,864</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>484,159</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>455,625</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1,241,131</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>185,600</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7,850</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>203,788</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>299,961</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1,735,077</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>2,253,531</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2,136,361</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>623,105</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>3,389,855</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>34,991</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1,412,782</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1,772,516</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>113,756</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>462,043</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>1,326,987</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>137,070</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1,808,118</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2,680,361</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>101,778</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>861,647</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1,670,950</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>188,047</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>69,778</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>392,713</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
TABLE 3 (continued)
FY 1978–1982 PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT PROJECT
FUNDING BY STATE AND LEGISLATIVE SECTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>SECTION 131</th>
<th>SECTION 132</th>
<th>SECTION 133</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of Projects</td>
<td>Amt. of Funding</td>
<td>No. of Projects</td>
<td>Amt. of Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>98,580</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15,858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>621,511</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18,674</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>693,538</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>1,518,088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>277,524</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>990,521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1,083,638</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>400,386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>426,762</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6,022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>54,358</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>134,404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>5,382,028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>104,752</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>99,631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>371,488</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>438,261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>1,866,804</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>1,948,304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,444</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>159,842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>237,333</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>46,675</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>329,385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>250,492</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1,279,197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>2,950,655</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>4,293,927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>99,934</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>32,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>101,468</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>85,268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virgin Islands</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-751,664</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>211,739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>139,806</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>113,908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>247,472</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>332,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>824,565</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>353,319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>80,170</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>211,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,287</strong></td>
<td><strong>34,089,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,342</strong></td>
<td><strong>33,361,630</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 4
FY 1978–1982 STATE PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS
BY LEGISLATIVE SECTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>7,281,868</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>5,961,480</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>8,096,368</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>7,987,238</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>4,762,046</td>
<td>1,287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>6,348,605</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>6,801,972</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>7,035,849</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>7,333,862</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>5,841,342</td>
<td>1,365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>5,274,686</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>7,395,276</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>8,382,249</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>9,308,248</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>6,827,056</td>
<td>1,342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>18,905,159</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>20,158,728</td>
<td>845</td>
<td>23,514,466</td>
<td>909</td>
<td>24,629,348</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>17,430,444</td>
<td>3,994</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27
Curriculum Development (Section 133)

1. The 1,342 projects conducted under this section received $37,187,515 obligated funds, an average of $27,711.

2. The number of projects ranged from 191 in FY 1978 to 313 in FY 1980.

3. The total amount of annual funding ranged from $5,274,686 in FY 1978 to $9,308,248 in FY 1981.

4. The number of projects in FY 1982 decreased by 12 percent from FY 1981 and the amount of obligated funds decreased by 27 percent from FY 1981.

Data for individual states or regions may be extracted from Table 4 for preparation of similar charts for graphic comparison of funding and projects or comparisons with other states, regions, or all states.

Figure 1 is a graphic representation of the number of projects funded and the total funds obligated during each of the five fiscal years.

Recipients of Project Funding

Table 5 is the distribution to different types of organizations which received funding for program improvement projects in each of the five fiscal years. Noteworthy findings reveal the following:

1. The average funding for projects conducted by four-year colleges/universities ($31,492) and research centers ($36,556) was significantly larger than projects conducted by two-year colleges ($20,636) and local education agencies ($22,446).

2. The number of projects conducted by four-year colleges and universities increased from FY 1978 through FY 1981, while the number of projects conducted by local education agencies decreased slightly.

Table 6 shows the percent of the total projects conducted and the percent of total funds by type of institution or agency. Principal findings are twofold:

1. Four-year colleges and universities and two-year junior colleges, technical schools, and community colleges received 48 percent of the funding to conduct projects.

2. Four-year colleges and universities and research/development/curriculum centers on the average conducted projects with more funding (as evidenced by the percent of projects versus percent of funding).

Table 7 shows the recipients of project funding by each of the three legislative sections. Noteworthy findings are listed below:
Figure 1. Summary of Program Improvement Funding by Legislative Section.
TABLE 5
RECIPIENTS OF PROJECT FUNDING
BY FISCAL YEAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Organization</th>
<th>FY 1978</th>
<th>FY 1979</th>
<th>FY 1980</th>
<th>FY 1981</th>
<th>FY 1982</th>
<th>5 Yr Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of Projects</td>
<td>Amt. of Funding</td>
<td>No. of Projects</td>
<td>Amt. of Funding</td>
<td>No. of Projects</td>
<td>Amt. of Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Year College/Universities</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>6,988,224</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>7,331,271</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>8,969,379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Education Agencies</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>6,151,978</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>6,737,366</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>6,299,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Year Colleges(Sr. College/Technical School/Community College)</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>1,930,514</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>2,137,782</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>2,314,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research/Development/Curriculum Organizations</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1,738,225</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1,667,983</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1,947,631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate Education Agencies</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>613,645</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>774,777</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1,327,714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Education Agencies</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1,148,251</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>863,521</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>842,362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business/Industry/Labor</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>114,067</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>325,584</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1,384,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Sector Organizations</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>39,500</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>72,502</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>293,951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>165,555</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>173,212</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29,321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Associations</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (not Identified)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>41,930</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>106,302</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| TOTALS | 735     | 18,905,159 | 810     | 20,158,728 | 845     | 23,514,466 | 909     | 24,629,348 | 695     | 17,430,444 | 3,994 | 104,638,165 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Organization</th>
<th>Percent of Projects</th>
<th>Percent of Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-Year Colleges/Universities</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>38.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Education Agencies</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>28.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Year College (Jr. College/Technical School/Community College)</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research/Development/Curriculum Organizations</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate Education Agencies</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Education Agencies</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business/Industry/Labor</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public-Sector Organizations</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Associations</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (not identified)</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Organization</td>
<td>SECTION 131 (research)</td>
<td>SECTION 132 (exemplary)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of Projects</td>
<td>Amt. of Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Year Colleges/Universities</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>15,415,469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Education Agencies</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>4,941,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Year College (Jr. College/Technical School/Community College)</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>3,099,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research/Development/ Curriculum Organizations</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>5,251,946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate Education Agencies</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1,286,368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Education Agencies</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>2,256,001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business/Industry/Labor</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1,291,117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Sector Organizations</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>231,684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>171,538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Associations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (not identified)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>128,767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>1,287</td>
<td>34,089,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Most projects conducted by four-year colleges and universities were funded under Section 131 (research) and Section 133 (curriculum development).

2. Most projects conducted by local education agencies were funded under Section 132 (exemplary and innovative).

**Target Populations**

Table 8 displays the number of projects and their funding directed at various target groups in each of the five fiscal years. Important findings are as follows:

1. The average amount of funding per project ranged by target population from a low of $16,426 for the teacher educator target group to $30,848 for research and development personnel.

2. The ratio of the number of projects and the amount of funds among target populations remained about the same over the five-year period.

Table 9 shows the percent of the total projects conducted and the percent of total funds by target population. Noteworthy findings are cited here:

1. The focus of 58.7 percent of the project funding and 56.2 percent of the number of projects were on teachers and coordinators.

2. Projects directed toward business/industry/labor, parents/community representatives, and institutional persons categories received less than 1.5 percent of the funding for all categories.

3. Only 1.2 percent of the projects are targeted at teacher educators, even though four-year colleges and universities conduct 38 percent of the projects.

Table 10 displays the number of projects and amount of funding directed at each target population by legislative section. Important findings are three in number:

1. Sixty-two percent of the projects directed toward local administrators and 84 percent of the projects directed toward state administrators and supervisors were funded from Section 131 (research).

2. Two-thirds of the student-oriented projects were funded from Section 132 (exemplary and innovative).

3. Forty-eight percent of the projects directed toward teachers and coordinators were funded from Section 133 (curriculum development).
TABLE 8
TARGET POPULATION
BY FISCAL YEAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Population</th>
<th>No. of Projects FY 1979</th>
<th>Amt. of Funding FY 1979</th>
<th>No. of Projects FY 1980</th>
<th>Amt. of Funding FY 1980</th>
<th>No. of Projects FY 1981</th>
<th>Amt. of Funding FY 1981</th>
<th>No. of Projects FY 1982</th>
<th>Amt. of Funding FY 1982</th>
<th>5 Yr Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers/Coordinators</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>10,027,346</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>12,801,858</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>13,659,159</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>14,295,038</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>1,790,992</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2,113,169</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>3,184,005</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>2,885,133</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Administrators</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>1,920,041</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>2,312,749</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1,976,135</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>2,475,568</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research &amp; Development</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2,463,342</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>773,322</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1,757,038</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1,603,881</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Administrators/</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1,592,830</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1,136,200</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1,767,254</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>2,115,240</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>743,516</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>549,592</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>482,898</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>404,986</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance Personnel</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>207,822</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>261,617</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>193,917</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>245,132</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Educators</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business/industry/Lab</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34,633</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>81,155</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>297,665</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>225,908</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents/Community</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>32,870</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>45,073</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>137,799</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>209,542</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representatives</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29,520</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>64,463</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>109,456</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>83,213</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>96,880</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>66,052</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>165,652</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13,930</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Correctional) Persons</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (population not</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32,284</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>45,073</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>137,799</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>209,542</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>identified or multiple</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29,520</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>64,463</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>109,456</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>83,213</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>populations)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>96,880</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>66,052</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>165,652</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13,930</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTALS
735 18,905,159 810 20,158,728 845 23,514,666 909 24,629,348 695 17,430,444 3,994 104,638,145
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Population</th>
<th>Percent of Projects</th>
<th>Percent of Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers/Coordinators</td>
<td>56.2</td>
<td>58.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Administrators</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research &amp; Personnel Development</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Administrators/Supervisors</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance Personnel</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Educators</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business/Industry/Labor</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent/Community Representatives</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional (Correctional) Persons'</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Population not identified or multiple populations)</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Projects</td>
<td>Amt. of Funding</td>
<td>No. of Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers/Coordinators</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>11,650,536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1,978,406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Administrators</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>6,048,582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research &amp; Development Personnel</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>5,656,181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Administrators/Supervisors</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>6,304,816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance Personnel</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1,001,334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Educators</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>845,042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business/Industry/Labor</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28,343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents/Community Representatives</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>245,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional (Correctional) Persons</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>77,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (population not identified or multiple populations)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>253,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1,287</td>
<td>34,089,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Project Outcomes**

Table 11 shows the number of projects and their related funding by type of outcome for each of the five fiscal years. Primary findings are as follows:

1. Most items (outcomes) followed the general trend of peak funding during FY 1981.

2. The number of projects devoted to materials distribution has increased annually and is one of the few categories of activities remaining stable during FY 1982, a time of reduced funds devoted to research, exemplary and innovative, and curriculum development activities.

3. Nearly forty-two percent of the total funds were allocated to printed instructional materials (23.4 percent), career and vocational counseling (11.1 percent), and information systems (7.2 percent).

Table 12 shows the percent of projects and the percent of funding directed at the various categories of outcomes during FY 1978 through FY 1982. The main findings are these:

1. Printed instructional materials were produced by 22.4 percent of the projects and received 23.4 percent of the funds.

2. Twelve outcome categories each received less than one percent of the total funds.

3. Information systems and materials distribution projects usually received more funding than other types of projects (as evidenced by the percent of projects versus the percent of funding). The percent of funding is considerably higher in both cases.

Table 13 displays the number of projects and amount of funding for the various outcome categories by legislative section. Important findings are cited below:

1. Slightly over 60 percent of the curriculum-related activity was funded from Section 133 (curriculum development).

2. Nearly 88 percent of the career and vocational counseling projects were funded from Section 132 (exemplary and innovative).

3. Eighty-two percent of the planning projects were funded from Section 131 (research).

4. Eighty-seven percent of the projects classified as research were funded from Section 131 (research).

5. Over 78 percent of the training programs were funded from Section 132 (exemplary and innovative).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Printed Instructional Materials</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>4,006,809</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>6,537,631</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>6,866,751</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>3,693,029</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3,094,448</td>
<td>893</td>
<td>24,468,665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career/Vocational Counseling</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>2,589,331</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>2,490,801</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>2,409,617</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>2,496,533</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>1,678,570</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>11,664,852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Systems</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2,113,559</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1,420,172</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1,155,162</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1,685,418</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>927,880</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>7,502,191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Programs</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>805,107</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1,119,685</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>561,224</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>2,537,813</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>1,684,876</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>6,738,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Guide</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1,678,586</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>596,059</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1,650,282</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1,614,916</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1,166,641</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>6,706,484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inservice Education</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>530,985</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>778,931</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1,244,748</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1,416,734</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1,220,870</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>5,192,268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Print Instructional Materials Distribution</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>740,642</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>430,653</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1,124,477</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1,472,472</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1,161,408</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>4,929,652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials Distribution</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>493,266</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>522,494</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>663,568</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1,463,319</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1,595,600</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>4,738,227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>745,467</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1,027,288</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>933,031</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1,004,134</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>639,067</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>4,348,987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model (Exemplary)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>757,272</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>975,400</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1,151,191</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1,088,751</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>349,752</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>4,323,094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>787,088</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>685,933</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1,532,883</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>764,038</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>526,105</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>1,296,057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handbook/Guide</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>741,318</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>704,881</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1,169,298</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1,034,367</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>536,697</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>4,188,561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>476,664</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>934,617</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>361,759</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1,379,599</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1,009,897</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>1,624,426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs Assessment</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>443,759</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>437,136</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>707,741</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>849,038</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>115,606</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>2,553,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articulation</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>535,071</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>570,427</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>119,735</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>167,231</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>624,643</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>2,017,107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Placement</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>321,405</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>183,772</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>201,018</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>115,653</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>140,188</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>962,036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>134,624</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>145,436</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>43,814</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>451,725</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>171,236</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>66,835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>184,554</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>194,427</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>256,048</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>115,934</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>127,713</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>878,676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>197,555</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>150,913</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>90,345</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>77,535</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>86,399</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>602,747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCU Operation (Admin.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>112,911</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>159,603</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>135,913</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>164,562</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>562,989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feasibility Study</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>138,410</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>62,276</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>115,798</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>178,874</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26,700</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>522,058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Involvement</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>80,282</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>66,531</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>126,287</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36,855</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>205,305</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>515,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consortium</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27,500</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>208,200</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>115,264</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>49,832</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>430,796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Services</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>78,300</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>189,829</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>88,594</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>56,553</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>413,276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Aide</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60,996</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>39,285</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100,281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature Review</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>38,142</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24,700</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>83,342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (e.g., staffing, public relations)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>101,198</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26,480</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>443,187</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>151,009</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>67,396</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>789,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>18,905,159</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>20,158,728</td>
<td>845</td>
<td>23,514,466</td>
<td>909</td>
<td>24,629,348</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>17,430,444</td>
<td>3,994</td>
<td>104,638,145</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 11
OUTCOMES OF PROJECTS
BY FISCAL YEAR
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Percent of Projects</th>
<th>Percent of Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Printed Instructional Materials</td>
<td>22.36</td>
<td>23.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Vocational Counseling</td>
<td>10.42</td>
<td>11.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Systems</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>7.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Programs</td>
<td>7.26</td>
<td>6.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Guide</td>
<td>6.31</td>
<td>6.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inservice Education</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>4.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Print Instructional-Materials</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>4.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials Distribution</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>4.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>4.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>4.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>4.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handbook/Guide</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>3.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs Assessment</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articulation</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Placement</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCU Operation</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feasibility Study</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Involvement</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consortium</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Services</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Aids</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature Review</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (e.g., staffing, public relations)</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>SECTION 131 (Research)</td>
<td>SECTION 132 (Exemplary)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of Projects</td>
<td>Amt. of Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printed Instructional Materials</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>4,294,751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career/Vocational Counseling</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1,186,765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Systems</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>3,227,743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Programs</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>469,267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Guide</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2,099,193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inservice Education</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1,381,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Print Instructional Materials</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>457,306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials Distribution</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1,119,848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>3,281,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model (Exemplary)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>2,431,154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>3,650,938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handbook/Guide</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>2,286,665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>3,599,012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs Assessment</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>1,574,989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articulation</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>397,866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Placement</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>413,741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>857,159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>203,795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>503,896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCU Operation (Admin.)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>562,989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feasibility Study</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>363,117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Involvement</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consortium</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>44,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Services</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>135,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Aide</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>55,996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature Review</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (e.g., staffing, public relation)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>344,045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1,287</td>
<td>34,089,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Project Priorities

Table 14 depicts the number of projects and related funding by program priority or problem area in each of the five fiscal years. Noteworthy findings are as follows:

1. The largest number of projects relating to the handicapped (77) occurred in FY 1981 while the largest number of projects relating to the disadvantaged (51) occurred in FY 1979.

2. The highest priority for numbers of projects and the amount of funding was curriculum. Investment steadily increased during FY 1978 through FY 1981 and retained its relative standing for FY 1982.

3. The investment in dissemination of information and educational products has been relatively stable over the five-year period.

4. Transition from school to work (9 projects), native Americans (8 projects), inner-city education (4 projects), and aging (7 projects) received little attention.

Table 15 shows the percent of projects and the percent of funding directed toward the various priorities during FY 1978 through FY 1982. Noteworthy findings reveal the following:

1. Over 33 percent of the projects and nearly 35 percent of the funds were specifically directed toward curriculum development.

2. The handicapped (7.5 percent), evaluation (6.5 percent), career development (11.2 percent), and dissemination of information and products (9.0 percent) were the only other priorities that received over five percent of the total funds.

3. Projects that address administration of vocational education, adult education, evaluation, community/education linkage, and teacher education were usually funded below the average level, while projects dealing with bilingual vocational education, handicapped, and dissemination of information and products were funded above the average level (see comparison of percentage of projects vs. percentage of funding).

Table 16 shows the number of projects and related funding by program priority or problem area for each of the legislative sections. Primary findings are four in number:

1. Over two-thirds of the projects addressing the administration of vocational education were funded under Section 131 (research).

2. Fifty-three percent of the projects directed toward the handicapped and disadvantaged were funded from Section 132 (exemplary and innovative).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of Projects</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6,153,036</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>7,171,796</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>7,694,144</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>8,171,796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Funding</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>7,171,796</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>7,694,144</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>8,171,796</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>7,106,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Projects</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1,908,960</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1,229,374</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2,060,674</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2,453,807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Funding</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1,229,374</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2,060,674</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2,453,807</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1,799,158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Projects</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1,062,413</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>1,375,439</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>1,352,663</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1,909,095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Funding</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>1,375,439</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>1,352,663</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1,909,095</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>731,782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Projects</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35,460</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>47,400</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>120,240</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17,222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Funding</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>47,400</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>120,240</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17,222</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>244,928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Projects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Funding</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Projects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21,977</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>44,430</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38,099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Funding</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21,977</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>44,430</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38,099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Projects</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>168,069</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17,843</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1,189,542</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>403,827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Funding</td>
<td>168,069</td>
<td>17,843</td>
<td>1,189,542</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>403,827</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>201,475</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>18,992,159</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>20,150,726</td>
<td>845</td>
<td>23,514,666</td>
<td>909</td>
<td>24,624,924</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 15
FY 1978–1982 PRIORITIES ADDRESSED BY PROJECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priorities</th>
<th>Percent of Projects</th>
<th>Percent of Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>33.20</td>
<td>34.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Development</td>
<td>11.39</td>
<td>11.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissemination of Information Products</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>9.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handicapped</td>
<td>6.79</td>
<td>7.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>8.36</td>
<td>6.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration of Vocational Education</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>4.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disadvantaged</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Policy Formation</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Development</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>2.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry &amp; Education Linkage</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex Equity</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual Vocational Education</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technological Problems</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Placement</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Education</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Education</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and Economic Problems</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Education</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community/Education Linkage</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displaced Homemakers</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Skills</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifted and Talented</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition from Education to Work</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Americans</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aging'</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner City Education</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (e.g., research priority setting)</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTALS**                                            **100.0**            **100.0**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priorities</th>
<th>SECTION 131 (research)</th>
<th>SECTION 132 (example)</th>
<th>SECTION 133 (curriculum)</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of Projects</td>
<td>Amt. of Funding</td>
<td>No. of Projects</td>
<td>Amt. of Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>6,734,163</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>4,706,843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Development</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1,256,272</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>10,096,913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissemination of Information/Products</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>4,570,555</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1,335,926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handicapped</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>2,511,359</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>4,10,381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>5,848,835</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>529,893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration of Vocational Education</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>3,082,334</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1,175,885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disadvantaged</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>807,062</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>2,031,631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Policy Formation</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>2,650,062</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>147,881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Development</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>907,500</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1,058,439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry/Education Linkage</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>793,056</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>568,515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex Equity</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>949,150</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>793,664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual Vocational Education</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>138,649</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1,164,275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technological Problems</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>423,046</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>551,276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Placement</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>387,135</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>797,765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Education</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>793,142</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>127,164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Education</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19,915</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>936,062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and Economic Problems</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>164,919</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>570,057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Education</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>349,840</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>239,514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community/Education Linkage</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>295,226</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>274,314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displaced Homemakers</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>185,581</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>80,484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic/Skills</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>168,259</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>127,739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifted and Talented</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50,633</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>205,705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability (Reporting)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>120,114</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>84,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition from Education to Work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>145,022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Americans</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,350</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>210,114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aging</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33,780</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>84,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner City Education</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>74,407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (e.g., research priority setting)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>809,654</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>450,005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1,287</td>
<td>34,089,000</td>
<td>1,365</td>
<td>33,361,630</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. More than 81 percent of the projects related to career development were funded from Section 132 (exemplary and innovative).

4. Eighty-two percent of the evaluation projects were funded from Section 131 (research).
IN-DEPTH ANALYSIS OF CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

Over one-third of the 3,994 projects and funding ($104,638,145) for state-administered vocational education program improvement during the period FY 1978 through FY 1982 have been categorized as curriculum development. In addition to Section 133 projects, many abstracts categorized in other legislative sections show evidence of curriculum-related activity. This major emphasis on curriculum development as a program improvement activity, triggered closer scrutiny of individual abstracts to determine the kinds of activities undertaken.

Through a search of the program improvement database, abstracts for 2,846 projects funded under Section 133 (curriculum development), and any projects funded under Section 131 (research) and Section 132 (exemplary and innovative) that contained the terms curriculum, curriculum development, or instructional materials were retrieved.

Curriculum for vocational program areas, multiple program areas, specific jobs, multiple jobs, or miscellaneous curriculum activities had been proposed as curriculum development projects.

Curriculum was to be developed in some form for an unspecified job title in a program area (e.g., agriculture, business and office, distributive education) in 603 program improvement projects. Eighty (80) curriculum-related projects promised development of curriculum or related activities in two or more occupational program areas without identifying the specific jobs. Four hundred thirty-seven (437) state program improvement projects addressed specific jobs. One hundred forty-eight (148) specific jobs identified through the review of the project abstracts appear in Table 17.

Two job titles were examined to determine the nature of the activities proposed: auto mechanics (71 projects) and word processing (29 projects). Within the auto mechanics job title, 62 of the 71 projects were related to curriculum development, the remaining 9 projects were curriculum related (i.e., dissemination, competency testing, staff development). Twenty-eight (28) projects proposed development or revision of curriculum for general auto mechanics without identifying any particular facet of the job. The remaining 34 projects were distributed among about 20 specific aspects of auto mechanics (e.g., auto body, emission control, air conditioning, power trains, auto parts, alcohol fuels, etc.).

Within the word processor operator job title 23 of the 29 projects related to curriculum development. The other six projects related to the dissemination of word processing curriculum and establishing word processing resource centers. Curriculum was to be developed or revised for both the secondary and postsecondary education levels. Several projects proposed writing curriculum
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job or Area</th>
<th>Legislative Section</th>
<th>131 (Research)</th>
<th>132 (Exemp.)</th>
<th>133 (Curric.)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accountants/Accounting</td>
<td>3(2)²</td>
<td>7(7)</td>
<td>6(6)</td>
<td>16(15)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agribusiness (Farm Manager)</td>
<td>5(4)</td>
<td>4(4)</td>
<td>19(16)</td>
<td>28(24)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol Fuels Production</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2(2)</td>
<td>2(2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Husbandry</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2(2)</td>
<td>2(2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquaculture</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3(3)</td>
<td>3(3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auctioneer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2(2)</td>
<td>2(2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audiovisual Equipment Repairer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1(1)</td>
<td>1(1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autobody Repairer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1(1)</td>
<td>8(6)</td>
<td>9(7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto Mechanics</td>
<td>9(8)</td>
<td>9(6)</td>
<td>53(47)</td>
<td>71(62)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1(1)</td>
<td>1(1)</td>
<td>2(2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Teller</td>
<td>1(1)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2(2)</td>
<td>3(3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biomedical</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1(1)</td>
<td>1(1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Law</td>
<td>1(0)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2(2)</td>
<td>3(2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and Office Machine Repairer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2(2)</td>
<td>2(2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpentry</td>
<td>9(8)</td>
<td>7(6)</td>
<td>19(15)</td>
<td>35(29)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical Technician</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4(4)</td>
<td>4(4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care/Development</td>
<td>7(6)</td>
<td>6(4)</td>
<td>18(18)</td>
<td>31(28)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coal Gasification</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1(1)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1(1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coal Miner/Mining</td>
<td>4(4)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2(2)</td>
<td>6(6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Art</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7(7)</td>
<td>7(7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Operator</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1(1)</td>
<td>1(1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Programmer/Programming</td>
<td>4(3)</td>
<td>7(5)</td>
<td>11(9)</td>
<td>22(17)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: ¹The terminology used in the project abstracts.

²The first figure represents the total number of curriculum related projects identified. The figures in parentheses are the number of projects that related specifically to curriculum development.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job of Area</th>
<th>Legislative Section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>131 (Research)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>132 (Exemp.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>133 (Curric.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation</td>
<td>10(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Worker/Building Trades</td>
<td>6(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooks</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copyfitter</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cosmetology</td>
<td>1(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminology</td>
<td>1(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairy Farmer</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day Care</td>
<td>2(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Processor</td>
<td>14(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dental Assistant(s)</td>
<td>1(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dental Hygienist(s)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dietetic Assistant</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dietitians/Nutritionists</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drafting</td>
<td>10(9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diesel Mechanic</td>
<td>1(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrician</td>
<td>3(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronics Technician</td>
<td>1(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Medical Technician</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Conservation</td>
<td>8(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Occupation/Management</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Life Education</td>
<td>1(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Equipment</td>
<td>1(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fashion Merchandising Industry</td>
<td>3(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feed Industry</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Fighter(s)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floriculture</td>
<td>1(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluid Mechanics</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Service</td>
<td>5(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                                     | 6(6)                |
|                                     | 23(22)              |
|                                     | 2(1)                |
|                                     | 1(1)                |
|                                     | 11(10)              |
|                                     | 2(1)                |
|                                     | 2(2)                |
|                                     | 2(2)                |
|                                     | 2(2)                |
|                                     | 1(1)                |
|                                     | 14(13)              |
|                                     | 2(1)                |
|                                     | 16(15)              |
|                                     | 2(1)                |
|                                     | 4(3)                |
|                                     | 4(3)                |
|                                     | 2(1)                |
|                                     | 36(29)              |
|                                     | 5(5)                |
|                                     | 4(4)                |
|                                     | 9(7)                |
|                                     | 1(1)                |
|                                     | 3(2)                |
|                                     | 5(5)                |
|                                     | 2(2)                |
|                                     | 3(3)                |
|                                     | 3(3)                |
|                                     | 1(1)                |
|                                     | 1(1)                |
|                                     | 5(5)                |
|                                     | 4(4)                |
|                                     | 7(5)                |
|                                     | 1(1)                |
|                                     | 2(1)                |
|                                     | 2(1)                |
|                                     | 35                  |

Total: 53
**TABLE 17 (continued)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job or Area</th>
<th>Legislative Section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>131 (Research)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gemologist</td>
<td>2(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graphic Arts</td>
<td>1(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geriatrics</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Assistant(s)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care Technician</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Equipment</td>
<td>1(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Management</td>
<td>1(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appliance Repairer</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horticulturist</td>
<td>5(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality Worker</td>
<td>1(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital Ward Clerk/Hosp. Personnel</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotels</td>
<td>1(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewing Machine Operator/</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewing Instruction</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Design</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrigation Technologist</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infant Care Aide</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laser Technologist, lasers</td>
<td>1(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Enforcement Officer/Police</td>
<td>2(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Secretary/Assistant para-legal</td>
<td>12(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machine Operator</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machine Repairer</td>
<td>3(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machinist</td>
<td>5(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine Biologist</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine Technician</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masonry</td>
<td>1(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Media</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meat Cutter</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Laboratory Technician</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Records Technician</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job or Area</td>
<td>Legislative Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>131 (Research)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Secretary</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medication Aide</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microcomputer Technician</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurse Aide</td>
<td>1(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing Home Administrator</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing Home Aide</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurse (LPN/RN)</td>
<td>2(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ornamental Horticulturist</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Educator/Education</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Management/Director</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petroleum Technician</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photographer</td>
<td>3(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poultry Production Specialist</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Technologist</td>
<td>1(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printer, Printing</td>
<td>2(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Equipment</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radiologic Technologist</td>
<td>1(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>3(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recordkeeper</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Vehicle Repairer</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refrigeration Mechanic</td>
<td>2(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reprography</td>
<td>1(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respiratory Therapist</td>
<td>1(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Business/Retailing</td>
<td>4(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Security Guard</td>
<td>1(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheet Metal</td>
<td>2(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>10(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign Language</td>
<td>1(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Business</td>
<td>7(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small, Engine Repair</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job or Area</td>
<td>Legislative Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>131 (Research)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solar Energy Installer</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solar Heating Mechanic</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solar Radiation</td>
<td>5(4) 8(7) 17(14) 30(25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solar Technician</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solar Engineer</td>
<td>2(2) 2(2) 1(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveyor</td>
<td>1(1) 1(1) 1(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Aide</td>
<td>1(1) 1(0) 7(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool and Die Maker</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism/Travel Manager</td>
<td>2(1) 5(3) 3(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck Driver</td>
<td>1(1) 1(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV Repairer</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typeset</td>
<td>1(1) 20(19) 21(20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typist</td>
<td>3(2) 5(4) 14(14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapy Technician</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Videotape Production</td>
<td>1(1) 1(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welder/Welding</td>
<td>9(9) 5(4) 24(20) 38(33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale Distributor</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word Processor Operator</td>
<td>4(1) 9(6) 16(16) 29(23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warehousing Specialist</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17 (continued)
guidelines for word processing, including course outlines, competencies, learning activities, teaching aids, evaluation procedures and criteria, reference sources, and bibliographies. One project proposed translating or adapting English and Spanish word processing materials, another included the purchase of word processing equipment and materials, and two projects proposed development of Vocational-Technical Education Consortium of States (V-TECS) catalogs (Word Processing Specialist and Word Processing Administrative Support Secretary).

One hundred sixty-three (163) projects described curriculum that was to be developed for two or more specific jobs. Some of these job title combinations by legislative section are shown in Appendix B.

The bulk of the curriculum related projects (1,563) fell in a miscellaneous curriculum activities category. These projects encompass a wide assortment of activities that range from articulation to V-TECS membership.

The most prevalent project emphases are: (1) articulation; (2) basic skills; (3) bilingual vocational education; (4) career awareness/education; (5) competency based vocational education; (6) community/industry/education linkage; (7) dissemination and utilization of information and products; (8) inservice training; (9) needs assessment/program evaluation; and (10) special needs. There are approximately 200 other categories that make up this miscellaneous group.
CONCLUSIONS

Several conclusions about state-administered program improvement activities can be drawn from the data reported in the previous section.

- The vocational education program improvement database is a useful tool for summarizing and analyzing vocational education research, exemplary and innovative, and curriculum development activity. Although this analysis reports composite information for all of the states, the database allows similar analysis for individual states.

- States seem to place a lower priority on research, exemplary and innovative, and curriculum development activities than on vocational guidance and counseling, personnel training, and sex equity. State program improvement projects funded during FY 1978-FY 1982 under Section 131 (research), Section 132 (exemplary and innovative), and Section 133 (curriculum development) represent about $105 million or 19.2 percent of the approximately $545 million allocated to states for program improvement and support services for the five-year period.

- States seem to allocate a rather stable portion (18.3 to 20.7 percent) of the federal allocation for program improvement to research, exemplary and innovative, and curriculum development activities. The variation in the number of projects and the amount of funds obligated for these activities parallels the variation in federal program improvement allocations to the states.

- States place about equal emphasis on research, exemplary and innovative, and curriculum development activities. The total amount of funds obligated by all states under each legislative section is nearly the same, however, individual states vary considerably, some choosing to fund no projects under certain legislative sections.

- Curriculum development seems to be perceived by the states to be more important than research and exemplary and innovative activities. With the exception of FY 1978, Section 133 (curriculum development) has had the most funds devoted to it.

- Public education agencies and institutions played a dominant role in conducting program improvement activities. Projects were conducted by educational agencies and institutions at every level. The largest share of projects were contracted to four-year colleges and universities (38.0 percent); local educational agencies (28.4 percent), and two-year colleges (10.0 percent).
States showed a heavy concern for assisting practicing teachers and a relatively small concern for teacher education programs. About 50 times as many resources were devoted to materials and services for local vocational and technical education teachers as for teacher educators.

State level commitment to dissemination is strong and stable in that the funds obligated for distribution of materials has increased annually.

The greatest program improvement effort has focused directly on improvement of instruction in local vocational education programs. Over 1,300 projects and $36 million was obligated specifically for curriculum development.
RECOMMENDATIONS

As a result of this analysis, the following recommendations are proposed relating to the maintenance and use of the vocational education program improvement database, to research, to policy, and to administration.

It is recommended:

- That the abstracts prepared by the research coordinating unit staff be more descriptive, clearly stating the objectives, procedures, target audiences, and outcomes of the project to increase the usefulness of the database.

- That the vocational education program improvement database be searched by researchers and curriculum developers before beginning a research or curriculum development project to reduce duplication of effort.

- That the vocational education program improvement database also include information about Section 135 (vocational education personnel training) projects which may account for 50 percent of the Subpart 3 (Program Improvement and Support Services) investment.

- That state departments of education use the information in the RIVE database as a basis for program improvement planning and decision-making.

- That systematic studies of the impact of state level program improvement activities conducted during the past five years be undertaken to determine the extent and nature of vocational education program improvement.

- That the curriculum development activities be closely coordinated across states to reduce duplication and maximize the use of the material.

- That the relative merits of states funding a few large program improvement projects versus funding many small efforts be studied.

- That the allocation of program improvement funds between inservice education and preservice education be examined, as the process relates to short term payoff versus long term solutions.
APPENDIX A

SAMPLE PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT PROJECT ABSTRACT
SAMPLE PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT PROJECT ABSTRACT

24
AN 007145. 8210.
FS 133.
FY 1982.
ST Washington.
PI WA8213328.
NO CN: 82-AMB(164)ER.
TI Information Processing Course Development.
PD Weaver, Dianne; Lundstrom, Shirley.
PHONE: (206) 532-9020.
ON Grays Harbor College.
Aberdeen, WA 98520.
OT College/University.
DT Start Date 30 Dec 81; End Date 31 Oct 82.
FF $2,288.
TP TEACHER/COORDINATOR.
EL HIGH SCHOOL AND POSTSECONDARY (10-14).
PR TRAINING PROGRAM.
PP CURRICULUM.
AB A course of study will be developed to teach information processing--an integrated approach to the combination of word and data processing. The project director will review existing materials, assess local materials through advisory committee members, develop Information Processing course materials, review materials with an advisory committee, make necessary revisions, and publish units. A final report will be delivered.
APPENDIX B

CURRICULUM ACTIVITY FOR MULTIPLE JOBS OR AREAS BY LEGISLATIVE SECTION
CURRICULUM ACTIVITY FOR MULTIPLE JOBS OR AREAS
BY LEGISLATIVE SECTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jobs or Areas 1</th>
<th>Section 131</th>
<th>132</th>
<th>133</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accountant and Cashier</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Economics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural, Industrial Arts, Business and Office and Home Economics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Mechanics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Conditioning, Electromechanical Technology and Heating</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto Mechanics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banker and Nurse's Aide</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual Translator, Math and English</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Trades Occupations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coal Mining and Agricultural Occupations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culinary Arts and Mathematics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educable Handicapped</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronics, Radio and TV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Management</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Management</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Equipment Maintenance and Mining</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Economics and Trade and Industrial Careers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Economics, Agricultural Marketing, Health and Industrial Arts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Economics and Nursing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Furnishing and Cloth Apparel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel Management Occupations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel/Restaurant and Food Service Management</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Safety</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Reclamation and Mining Technology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear Energy Analysis, Mathematics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: 1The terminology used in the project abstracts.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jobs or Areas</th>
<th>Section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tourism/Restaurant Management</td>
<td>131:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welding and Cabinet Making</td>
<td>132:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Conditioning and Refrigeration</td>
<td>133:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto Diesel and Appliance Repair</td>
<td>131:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto Mechanic and Building Trades</td>
<td>132:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Technology</td>
<td>133:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banking and Skilled Crafts</td>
<td>131:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpentry and Masonry</td>
<td>132:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC Electric, Hydraulic Systems</td>
<td>133:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diesel Mechanic and Appliance Repair</td>
<td>131:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Conservation Occupations</td>
<td>132:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishery Industry</td>
<td>133:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry and Ranching</td>
<td>131:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health, Carpentry, Auto Mechanic, Cosmetology, Food Service, and Machine Shop</td>
<td>132:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel and PBX Operations</td>
<td>133:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape Industry</td>
<td>131:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laser/Electric/Optic Technology</td>
<td>132:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine Occupations</td>
<td>133:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micro-Minicomputer Training</td>
<td>131:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mine Technology</td>
<td>132:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Room Technology</td>
<td>133:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petro Chemical and Transportation</td>
<td>131:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petroleum Industry Occupations</td>
<td>132:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Science</td>
<td>133:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production Agriculture and Horticulture</td>
<td>131:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Services and Related Occupations</td>
<td>132:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railroad Maintenance Occupations</td>
<td>133:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell Fishery Industry</td>
<td>131:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solar Energy Occupations</td>
<td>132:11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### CURRICULUM ACTIVITY FOR MULTIPLE JOBS OR AREAS
BY LEGISLATIVE SECTION (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jobs or Areas</th>
<th>Section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surgical Technicians</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecommunication and Mass Media</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism and Hospitality</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Treatment Plant and Distribution System Operators</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word Processing and Accounting</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting, Forest Products, Graphics and Health Occupations</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising Services</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Chemicals, Nursing, and Landscape, Design</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Conditioning and Heating, Automotives, Engine Technology, and Building Trades</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appliance Repairer and Electronics Technician</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Drafting and Word Processing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto Body, Carpentry, Commercial Foods, Design Tailoring, Electrical Trades, Machine Trades, Medical Assistant, Plumbing, Welding, Auto Mechanics, Commercial Baking, Cosmetology, Diesel Mechanic, Health Assistant, Masonry, Medical Secretary, and Retail Trades</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto Mechanics, Carpentry, Office Practice, Retailing, Health Assistant, and Electrical Trades</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto Mechanics, Office Practice, Food Service, Health Assistant, and Electrical Trades</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automotive Petroleum Occupations</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automotive Technology, Computer Science, Criminal Justice, Drafting, and Design</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aviation, Computers, Electronics, Environmental Protection, and Medical</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blaster, Surface Laborer, Machine Operator, Surface Mechanics, and Electrician</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpentry, General Retailing and Conservation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### CURRICULUM ACTIVITY FOR MULTIPLE JOBS OR AREAS
#### BY LEGISLATIVE SECTION (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jobs or Areas</th>
<th>Section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carpentry/Woodworking, Welding and Cutting, Machine Shop, Auto Mechanic, and Small Engine Repair</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cashier/Checker</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coal Mining Occupations</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computers and Building Trades</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative Occupations and Building and Ground Maintenance</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Language Technology</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Operator, Data Entry, Lubrication Specialist, Auto Tune-Up, and Machinist</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Trades</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cosmetology, Data Processing, LPN, Machine Operator, Small Engine, Welding, and Electrical Trades</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cosmetology, Machine Operator, and Welding</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custodial Services</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custom Dressmaking, Certified Lab Assistant, Homemaking, Farm Equipment Mechanic, and Commercial Art, Layout</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Processing, Cosmetology, Small Engines, Carpentry, Construction, and Food Service</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Processing and Computer Science</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Processing Occupations</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dental Hygienist, Medical Record Keeping, and Property Manager</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dental Lab and Refrigeration Mechanic</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electric Lines Person, Water and Wastewater, Building Codes Inspection, and Construction Equipment</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity, Avionics; Automotive Science, Solar Energy, and Office Machines</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Technicians and Fire Science Employees</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronics, Automotive, and Printing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs or Areas</td>
<td>Section 131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronics and Electricity Occupations</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronics and Engineering Technology</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronics and Energy Occupations</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Conservation, Heavy Equipment (Diesel) Repair, Plant Maintenance, Horticulture, and Landscaping</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Occupations</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming and Fiberglass Lamination</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and Credit Occupations</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Prevention Occupations</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishery Occupations</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food and Automotive Occupations</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Service and Chef Training</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Service and Electronics</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardening, Groundskeeping, Floriculture, and Turf Management</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Construction Trades, Co-op Part-time Training, Office Duplication Practice, General Metal Trades, and Commercial Display and Decoration</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graphic Arts, Auto Body, Auto Mechanics, Machine Shop, Electronics, AC Electronics, Dental Assistant, Health Occupations Inservice, and Body Structure</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graphics, Letterpress, Offset Lithography, and Electrical Trades</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graphics, Radio-TV, Electronics, and Electrical Trades</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm and Garden Occupations</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Service Aide and Food Production Services</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel/Motel Occupations</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housekeeping and Sewing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance and Agriculture Services</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs or Areas</td>
<td>Section 131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Survey, Field Technician, and Nuclear Medical Technology</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machine Shop Occupations</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management and Family Economics</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing Occupations</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meat Processing and Grain Elevator Operations</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Technology</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metals Programs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microcomputer Occupations</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Practice, Carpentry, Food Service, General Merchandising and Retailing, Health Assistant, and Electrical Trades</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil, Mining, Solar Energy, and Office Occupations</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ornamental Horticulture Industry</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing and Electronics Occupations</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Mechanics and Auto Mechanics</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RN and Dental Assistant</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radiographic and Radio Communication Technicians</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate, and Business and Personal Services</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretarial, Data Processing, Autobody, Plumbing, and Small Engines and Tractor Mechanics Occupations</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone Industry Occupations</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and Warehousing Occupations</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water and Wastewater Treatment Plant Operators</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welding and Furniture Making</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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