DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 078 548 95 EA 005 212

AUTHOR Brickell, Henry M.
TITLE Survey of State Education Department Research, Development, Demonstration, Dissemination and Evaluation RDDDE, 1969-70.
INSTITUTION Institute for Educational Development, New York, N.Y.
SPONS AGENCY National Center for Educational Research and Development (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE [71]
CONTRACT OEC-0-9-090914-4631
NOTE 283p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$9.87
DESCRIPTORS Administrative Organization; *Comparative Analysis; Comparative Statistics; Demonstration Projects; Educational Finance; *Educational Research; Educational Researchers; *Information Dissemination; *Organizational Development; Personnel Data; Program Evaluation; Questionnaires; Research Methodology; Research Projects; *State Departments of Education; Surveys; Tables (Data)

ABSTRACT

This study is designed in part to update a 1965 publication and to note changes in the pattern of State research and research related activities since that time. It is intended to provide State research directors with an exchange of State department practices in organization, staffing, funding, and contracting for research related activities; an identification of projects completed and under way; and an identification of personnel employed in State departments. Survey data were gathered through (1) site visits to 12 geographically representative States known to be active in research and development; (2) mailed questionnaires that probed into the organization, financing, staffing, and content of State activities -- not only in the research unit but also throughout the department; and (3) meetings at the nine regional USOE offices where RDDDE personnel from 31 States discussed the situations in their own departments. The procedures used to collect and analyze the data are described in one chapter; another chapter presents the results of the work; and the presentation concludes with a reflection on the meanings of the findings, an interpretation, and general recommendations. Eight appendixes contain definitions of terms, samples of instruments used in the study, lists of people participating, statistical tables, a project catalogue, and a project list. (Author/MLF)

SURVEY OF STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, DEMONSTRATION, DISSEMINATION AND EVALUATION

RDDDE

1969-70

Henry M. Brickell
Project Director

INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT
52 Vanderbilt Avenue
New York, New York 10017
212-686-8910

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to contract OEC-0-9-090914-4631 with the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education provision or policy.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A large number of individuals assisted in conceiving, designing, and supplying data for this investigation.

A special word of appreciation goes to the Advisory Committee comprised of state personnel engaged in research-related activities which has served since the inception of this study, helping to shape its goals, its content, and its procedures. Committee members have been ready to assist whenever necessary, traveling, criticizing and commenting. For this, they are owed a special debt of gratitude. The members of the Committee are:

Milton Baum, Director of Personnel and Community Relations, Oregon State Education Department

James Crandall, Chief of the Bureau of Evaluation and Instructional Services, California State Education Department

Richard McKay, Assistant Superintendent, Research, Planning and Evaluation, Maryland State Education Department

Charles Nix, Associate Commissioner, Planning, Research and Evaluation, Texas Education Agency

Stanley Salett, Associate Commissioner for Research and Development, New Jersey State Education Department

William Shabacker, Assistant Director of Research, Planning and Evaluation, Georgia State Education Department

Rowan Stutz, Director of Research and Innovation, Utah State Education Department

Lorne Woollatt, Associate Commissioner for Research, New York State Education Department

Personnel in twelve state education departments aided the work by supplying case material during on-site interviews. The findings from these site visits led to a considerable sharpening of questions in the survey forms.

Nine meetings hosted by personnel in the nine U.S. Office of Education regional offices allowed the IED staff to explain the intent of the study and to answer questions about the instruments for the state personnel who attended. These meetings also allowed the IED staff to gain additional insights into state problems in conducting research-related activities. The names of the USOE regional office personnel who sponsored the meetings at IED's request and the names of the state personnel in attendance are listed in Appendix D, Regional Meetings.

Hundreds of others participated by supplying data in answer to questionnaires. Most of those who did so are listed in Appendix E, RDDE Personnel. Additional names appear in the abstracts in Appendix G, Project Catalogue, and in Appendix H, Project List.

Special appreciation is owed to David Pollen, assistant chief of the U.S. Office of Education National Center for Educational Research and Development, for his interest in the study, and to Lloyd Johnson of the NCERD staff who served as project monitor and offered helpful guidance.

Patrick F. Toole of the Pennsylvania State Department of Public Instruction served as consultant to IED throughout the study. Among his many other responsibilities, Dr. Toole conducted all of the 12 site visits and the 9 regional meetings described later.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF APPENDICES

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

This study was authorized by the U. S. Office of Education National Center for Educational Research and Development, partly at the request of a number of research directors in state education departments. It was of interest to USOE/NCERD because of the implications it might have for Federal policy with respect to the research, development, demonstration, dissemination, and evaluation activities carried on by state education departments. It was of interest to the state research directors for a variety of reasons, including having an exchange of state department practices in organization, staffing, funding, and contracting for research-related activities; identification of projects completed and under way; identification of personnel employed in state departments; and so on.

In 1965 the Office of Education had published Research in State Departments of Education (OE-23040)*. The report described research services made available through state departments, research support in the form of legislative authorization and appropriations for state activities, the administrative structure for research within state departments, and organizations of agencies engaged in research. In addition, the 1965 study listed research projects being carried on by the state agencies, including those funded under the Cooperative Research Act.

The questionnaire on which the 1965 study was based was issued in the fall of 1963, with returns received from all 50 states by the spring of 1964. Thus the data collected preceded the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

*The report of a study by John M. Bean, Specialist, State Education programs. Superintendent of Documents Catalog No. FS5.223:23040, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

In its solicitation to contractors interested in undertaking a new study in 1969-70, the Office of Education stated:

> In the four-year interval since ESEA was enacted, the amount of support for research, development, and dissemination has increased markedly. Today there exists no comprehensive survey of the organization and conduct of research, development, and dissemination activities by state education authorities, no inclusive statement of the research commonalities and differences among the states, and no specific catalog of studies under way or completed.

This study is designed in part to update the 1965 publication and to note changes in the pattern of state research and research-related activities since that time.

Advisory Committee

In view of the interest of state department research personnel in the conduct and findings of the survey, an Advisory Committee of eight persons was appointed to oversee the work. Committee members came from state departments with an established record of research and development: California, Georgia, Maryland, New Jersey, New York, Oregon, Texas, and Utah. The names of individual committee members appear in the Acknowledgements. The Advisory Committee reviewed the work at major junctures and offered advice on policy questions. Members also assisted during the site visits and the regional meetings described in Chapter 2, Methodolgy.

Definitions

In its solicitation outlining the study, the Office of Education stated:

> The contractor will work in close cooperation with the OE project officer in defining key terms, including research, development, demonstration, and

> dissemination. Sharp delineation and clear understanding of these terms should be established early in the contract.

IED took this stipulation quite seriously. We agreed fully that careful definitions of terms were essential, particularly since in the late 1960's the key terms used in this survey were being given diverse definitions. Definitions were drafted, submitted to the Advisory Committee and discussed with state personnel during the twelve site visits described in Chapter 2, Methodology, before being published as they appear in Appendix A, Definitions. The final definitions appeared to be useful to state personnel in that they tended to submit data which fell within the defined boundaries. The definitions were also useful to the IED staff in screening out projects which did not seem sufficiently research-related to merit publication in Appendix G, Project Catalogue, or in Appendix H, Project List.

Preliminary Reports

A report of the preliminary finds of this survey, which was then in its final stages, was made to approximately thirty state directors of research and ancillary personnel held at the Annual Meeting of the American Education Research Association in New York, New York, in the spring of 1971. The meeting was also attended by key officials of the U. S. Office of Education National Center for Educational Research and Development.

A published version of the preliminary findings appears as "Research, Development, Demonstration and Dissemination" in Emerging State Responsibilities For Education, arranged and edited by Edgar L. Morphet, David L. Jesser, and Arthur P. Ludka, 1970.*

The Nature of This Report

The remainder of this report is organized as follows: Chapter 2, Methodology, describes the procedures used to collect and analyze the data. Chapter 3, Findings, presents the results of the work. Chapter 4, Commentary, reflects on the meanings of the findings, offers an interpretation, and makes general recommendations.

The appendices contain definitions of terms, instruments used in the study, lists of people participating, statistical tables, a catalogue of projects and a list of projects. A complete list of the appendices appears at the front of this volume.

The Advisory Committee and the USOE project monitor encouraged the Project Director to use his own experience and judgment as well as the empirical findings of the study in interpreting the findings and making recommendations. Rather than doing this throughout the body of Chapter 3, Findings, the director has reserved his remarks for Chapter 4, Commentary.

*The book is a publication of the multi-state project entitled Improving State Leadership in Education, 1362 Lincoln Street, Denver, Colorado, 80203 supported under ESEA Title V, section 505.

Chapter 2

METHODOLOGY

The survey involved the gathering of data by 1) site visits to 12 geographically representative states known to be active in research and development*; 2) mailed questionnaires probing into the organization, the financing, the staffing and the content of state activities--not in the research unit alone but throughout the department, and 3) meetings at the 9 regional USOE offices which RDDDE personnel from 31 states attended to discuss the situation in their own departments.

In order to insure compatability of answers, the terms research, development, demonstration, dissemination and, evaluation were defined specifically. Those definitions are discussed first.

Definitions

The key terms used in this survey are typically used to denote so many different functions that the information gathered would mean little unless the terms were given sharp definitions. A set of definitions for the key terms was drafted by the IED staff and submitted to the Advisory Committee, to a representative group of state research directors and ancillary personnel, and to the project monitor in the U.S. Office of Education. The draft definitions were modified after being reviewed and were then published and attached to copies of the survey questionnaires for distribution.

A full copy of each definition appears in Appendix A, in the form in which it was distributed to state personnel. The definitions are briefly summarized below:

* California, Colorado, Georgia, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Texas, Utah and Wisconsin.

Research was defined as the analysis of data for the purpose of making generalizations. The definition explained that the analysis could be performed upon data gathered either by the researcher himself or by someone else. It stressed data analysis and the search for generalizations. It excluded gathering and tabulating data unless they were accompanied by an attempt to generalize.

Development was defined as the systematic use of research-based generalizations to create new educational methods, systems, materials, or devices which have practical utility. The statement treated pilot trials to test feasibility and gather ideas for improvement as an integral part of development. Development had to be accompanied by research either before or during the effort.

Demonstration was defined as the deliberate display-in-action of new methods systems, materials or devices which are the products of research-based development. The statement said that the demonstrations had to duplicate conditions of actual use. Thus passive exhibits of materials, equipment, or facilities were excluded. Any training which might have accompanied demonstration was also excluded.

Dissemination was defined as the sending of information either about the results of research or the products of development or the methods and materials being demonstrated. All forms of information transmission such as telephone calls, newsletters, films, and exhibits were included. Any training which might accompany information dissemination was excluded.

Evaluation was defined as the gathering and processing of information to guide decision-making, but respondents were cautioned to include only evaluation activities which are research-like, such as tracing events to their causes or determining the effects of treatments. They were asked to exclude non-research forms of evaluation such as observing and judging ongoing programs or comparing data to a standard.

The Advisory Committee was eager to have the survey framed in such a way that it did not collect information on typical innovative projects of the kind funded under ESEA Title III or typical evaluations of projects funded under ESEA Title I. Committee members, like many other personnel interested in the outcomes of the study, did not want information on state research and development activities to be buried

under an avalanche of information about the innovative projects and evaluative studies which were extremely numerous in 1969-70 when the survey was being made. Therefore, without arbitrarily excluding all ESEA Title III and Title I projects, the definitions were written in such a way that those projects would be automatically excluded unless they had an authentic research base.

A Linear Relationship Between RDDDE Not Required. There has been considerable discussion among education researchers as to whether research-related activities should be thought of as proceeding in a linear fashion, with research followed by development followed by evaluation followed by dissemination and so on. Many researchers believe that these functions are not and/or should not be chained together in any straight-line fashion but that they are and/or should be carried on concomitantly, or in nested fashion, or with intermediate feedback loops but not be performed serially in some fixed order.

The definitions were carefully written to avoid any requirement that the functions be performed in a linear sequence. Although they may at first glance give the impression of a fixed series because of the order in which they are arranged, closer inspection will show that there is no mandatory sequence inherent in the definitions themselves.

Data Collection

The three methods used to collect data for the study are described below.

Site Visits. On-site interviews were planned for 12 geographically representative states known to be active in research and development: California, Colorado, Georgia, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Texas, Utah and Wisconsin. (Only 11 visits were scheduled inasmuch as a member of the Pennsylvania staff was serving as consultant to IED during the study, making an actual visit to that state unnecessary. Telephone interviews were used instead.)

The purpose of these visits was twofold: 1) to interview personally a representative sample of leaders and staff members engaged in research and related activities to learn more about the administrative structure of the RDDDE units, the work they had underway, and the problems and budgetary circumstances they faced, 2) to help define topics which could be probed further by mailed questionnaires to other state education departments.

One or more IED staff members or consultants spent one full day in 11 of the 12 states during the spring of 1970. The visitation schedule was arranged by a member of the department who had an administrative responsibility for a research-related function. The list of individuals making the arrangements appears in Appendix C, Site Visits.

Unstructured interviews were used to ask the administrative heads and staff members of RDDDE units about the administrative

organization of the unit; its relation to other segments of the department; the coordination of RDDDE with other departmental activities; the relationship of RDDDE to planning; the relation of the department's management information system or student information system to RDDDE functions; the relative importance of research versus program evaluation in the eyes of those inside and outside the department; the relation of state-sponsored research to state decision-making; the research base for state-supported innovation; the research base for ESEA Title III projects, especially the statewide and local needs assessments commonly supported under ESEA Title III; the place of the Vocational Education Research Coordinating Unit in relation to other units engaged in RDDDE; services to other units inside and outside the department, including local school districts; the use of outside contractors; sources of financing for RDDDE; the use of advisory committees and commissions; legislative interest in research-related activities; statewide organizations of agencies conducting RDDDE; and other topics.

Questionnaires. On the basis of the site visits, interviews and other information IED developed four separate questionnaires.

1. Survey of state education department research, development, demonstration, dissemination and evaluation.
2. Budget section.
3. Individual questionnaire--personal and professional background.
4. Project or activity report.

Copies of the four questionnaires were collated into packets designed for use by a single administrative unit within a state education department. Each packet contained one copy of the survey form, one copy of the budget section, ten copies of the individual questionnaire and ten copies of the project activity report. The chief administrator of the unit was asked to distribute the forms within his own unit, duplicating blank forms if additonal copies were needed.

To develop an initial mailing list, the administrative organization chart for each state education department was examined.* From each chart, each administrative unit whose title suggested it would be engaged in RDDDE was selected to receive a packet. Packets were accompanied by nomination forms, requesting that the unit head send IED the names of other units within the department which were engaged in RDDDE and thus should receive packets. Additional packets were mailed to all units thus nominated.

Each of the four questionnaires is described briefly below and the number of responses received is indicated. Complete copies of all four questionnaires appear in Appendix B, Questionnaires.

---

* Organization charts for the departments appeared in Education in the States: Historical Development and Outlook, edited by Jim B Pearson and Edgar Fuller, Council of Chief State School Officers National Education Association, Washington, D.C. 20036, 1969.

1. Survey of State Education Department Research, Development, Demonstration, Dissemination and Evaluation

After instructing the head of the administrative unit about how to distribute the other questionnaires in the packet, this questionnaire sought information about the administrative structure of the unit, its RDDDE activities during 1969-70, recent personnel separations, secretarial and clerical personnel in the unit assigned to RDDDE activities, multiple appointments of professional personnel with outside agencies such as universities, RDDDE training carried on by the administrative unit, observations and opinions of the organization and conduct of RDDDE in the department, and other definitions of RDDDE used in the department if they differed significantly from those used in the questionnaire.

Response. A total of 98 unit heads, representing 38 states, completed and returned this questionnaire. However, this response does not fully represent the total number of units engaged in RDDDE. Many units did not return the questionnaire and some states filled out only one questionnaire for the entire department, stating that almost all administrative units were performing some sort of RDDDE.

A total of 12 states reported that they were not engaged in RDDDE activities as defined in the questionnaire.

2. Budget Section

This questionnaire asked respondents to categorize their RDDDE budgets for the year 1969-70, distinguishing between Federal, state, philanthropic foundation and other funding sources and also differentiating between regular ongoing funds and special project funds.

Response. Fewer than half of the 98 units returning the first questionnaire were able to complete the Budget Section IED had anticipated this problem since a number of state research directors had indicated earlier in reviewing this questionnaire that it would be difficult to supply data in the categories requested because accounts are not kept in this fashion. They had nevertheless recommended that the form be included.

3. Individual Questionnaire--Personal and Professional Background

Unit heads were instructed to distribute this questionnaire only to those persons engaged more than half time in RDDDE for more than four months per year. (This limitation was intended to exclude personnel not engaged chiefly in managing or performing RDDDE as well as summer research assistants even if they were employed full time.)

The questionnaire sought information on the personal and professional background of the respondent, how he was recruited into the department, and how his time was distributed over RDDDE functions.

Response. A total of 354 individuals submitted usable responses.

4. Project or Activity Report

Respondents were asked to describe only those projects initiated on or after July 1, 1964, or started before that date and still underway, or planned for initiation during the 1970-71 school year. These restrictions were intended to limit the reports to recent and current projects.

The questionnaire asks for a description of the project, its starting and ending dates, its budget, the name of its director, and the name of administrative unit sponsoring it.

As with each of the four questionnaires, respondents were asked not to submit descriptions of projects or activities which did not meet the RDDDE definitions used in the study.

Response. Approximately 450 project reports were received. They differed considerably in clarity and completeness of description.

Regional Meetings. After the four questionnaires were distributed to the states, meetings at the nine Regional Offices of the U.S. Office of Education were arranged with representatives of the state units

receiving the questionnaires. These meetings were called to remind the state representatives of the purposes of the study, to encourage participation, to answer any questions about how to respond to the questionnaires, and to gather additional information not requested in the questionnaires themselves. All meetings were arranged in cooperation with the regional representative for the USOE National Center for Research and Development. In every case but one, that person was able to attend the meeting and participate in the discussion.

The four questionnaires distributed earlier by mail to the states served as the agenda for the meetings. Special attention was given to questions in the Survey of State Education Department RDDDE instrument, for which interview discussion served to supplement the interpretation of mailed responses. All regional meetings were recorded for later analysis.

A total of 42 persons representing 30 states attended the nine regional meetings. Participants are listed in Appendix D.

Data Analysis

Information obtained from the 12 site visits and the 9 regional meetings was not treated statistically but was used by the IED staff to elaborate and help interpret data collected by the mailed questionnaires. The information gathered during the visits and meetings had a considerable influence on the writing of the

Chapter 4, Commentary.

Information obtained from the four questionnaires was processed in the following manner:

1. Survey of State Education Department and Research, Development, Demonstration and Dissemination and Evaluation

   Statistical data from the questionnaire were tabulated and cross-tabulated where appropriate. The states were clustered into nine regions roughly corresponding to the USOE nine regional offices and the data were examined for regional differences. No especially interesting patterns emerged, probably because differences in RDDDE activities have more to do with such factors as the size and wealth of a state education department then with geographic location. Systematic differences among the regions were so few in number that they are not displayed in this report.

2. Budget Section

   And examination of data returned on this questionnaire indicated that it was not sufficiently accurate and reliable to be worth analyzing. IED had anticipated this from previous testimony from state representatives, who noted that state financial accounting systems are of course not maintained according to the definitions used in this study. After considering alternative approaches IED reluctantly concluded that to analyze and present the data could lead to erroneous conclusions about the financing of RDDDE. Therefore it was decided that the data should not be reported.

3. Individual Questionnaire--Personal and Professional Background

   Information obtained in this questionnaire was tabulated and cross-tabulated where appropriate to determine the characteristics, backgrounds, and current activites of RDDDE personnel. The results are reported in Chapter III, Findings. The tabular presentations appear in Appendix F, Tables.

4. Project or Activity Report

   Of the approximately 450 forms received, 157 were

selected for abstracting and an additional 100 were selected for listing. The abstracts appear in Appendix G, Project Catalogue, while the lists appear in Appendix H, Project List.

The criteria used both for cataloguing and for listing projects were these:

a) Appropriateness, that is, the project fit the definitions used in the study.

b) Representativeness, that is, the project typified the other projects report in area of concern, methodology, scope, cost and length.

c) Quality, that is, the project appeared to be among the best conceived projects of its particular type.

d) Clarity of Description, that is, the information supplied was sufficient to allow abstracting or listing.

Chapter 3

FINDINGS

This chapter contains the results of the site visits to 12 states, the mailed questionnaires, and the 9 regional meetings, all of which are described in Chapter 2, Methodology. Data from all three sources are merged under common topics rather than being presented separately.

The chapter is divided into the following sections: administrative organization, RDDDE functions, staffing and RDDDE projects. While some interpretations of the data appear in this chapter, the overall conclusions and interpretation growing out of the findings are presented in Chapter 4, Commentary.

Non-Reporting States. A total of 50 out of 52 agencies surveyed (the 50 states plus Washington, D.C. and Puerto Rico) responded in some way. However, 12 of the 50 respondents of about 25 percent of the total said that, using the definitions employed in the survey, they had nothing to report. (See Table 1*.) They explained that for lack of funds or lack of personnel or the press of other duties, they were not engaged in the defined activities. Most added that they would like to be or hoped to be in the future.

One state research director said:

> After careful study of the definitions for this survey, it is our opinion that we do not come within the specifications of the definitions simply because we perform a multitude of other tasks which makes it impossible to devote 50 percent or more time to any one or all of the areas included in the study.

Another state research director explained the situation in these words:

*All tables referred to in this chapter appear in Appendix E, Tables.

> At present the department of education does not have a division which cuts across all lines and functions in a manner consistent with your definitions. Such a division is in the discussion stage.

He went on to explain that discussions were underway with a state university which might result in the organization of a new division.

Other states also spoke of their expectations for the future, which would in some cases contrast sharply with the present. One said:

> At the present time, almost all RDDDE activities in the Department of Education are conducted by a Research Consultant located within the Federal Relations and Programs Branch of the Division of Operations.
>
> We have recently gained approval for a Division of Planning and Evaluation within the Department and are currently recruiting personnel for this new Division.

In another state in which no person spent even 50 percent of his time on research-connected activities, as defined, the respondent wrote about the creation of a new nine-man unit, beginning immediately:

> We are in the process of forming a true Planning, Research, and Evaluation unit with the anticipated support of a grant under Title IV, Section 402, ESEA and the use of Title III and Title V funds. We hasten to add that our Department is active in many aspects related to the thrust of your survey and that--given the financial resources--it expects to restructure its organization so that it will have an administrative unit staff and operate it so as to enable it to achieve (through the use of its entire staff) the objectives implicit in your definitions and questionnaires..

Responses from several other states expressed regret at being unable to participate but said that to do so, given the definitions used, would be misleading. It became evident in later discussions with these men that they regarded many projects, like those currently sponsored under ESEA Title III, as significant and useful even though they did not have a research base.

In summary, almost all of those who could not report regretted that they were not now engaged in RDDDE activities. Given the almost universally favorable attitude toward RDDDE among those surveyed, it seems quite significant that 25 percent of the states had none to report.

Location of RDDDE in the administrative structure. The placement of RDDDE functions in the department is not usually governed by a management plan, according to a plurality of those surveyed, but it usually should be, according to two-thirds of them. Thus the administrators of state units engaged in RDDDE are less than satisfied with the unplanned distribution of those functions throughout the department. Most unit heads said that management studies had not usually altered the departmental structure for RDDDE but a heavy majority favored studies that could lead to some modification. (See Table 4, items 26 and 32.)

It was evident from interview data that the unit heads were not seeking a rigid allocation of functions but were seeking greater order.

Administrative Organization

The survey was addressed not only to the "research" unit in the department, if any, but to any unit performing RDDDE functions. Of the 38 states reporting RDDDE activities, 16 indicated that a single administrative unit in the department carried out such activities. Another 13 indicated that two units did so. The remainder reported RDDDE taking place in from three to twenty different administrative units. It is clear from the data that RDDDE activities as defined in the survey are widely

scattered in the departments and, by implication, that the personnel carrying them out are often located in bureaus that operate programs, rather than being assigned to a special RDDDE unit. Single RDDDE units tend to appear in smaller departments; larger departments typically have multiple units performing RDDDE. (See Table 2.) The scattering of the functions is confirmed by the data in Table 3 which shows that well over half of the 98 units reporting referred to other units engaged only about 25 percent of the units performing RDDDE report directly to the chief state school officer. About 40 percent report through one intervening layer, about 25 percent through two, and the remainder through three or more.

These data indicate that RDDDE functions are scattered throughout the administrative levels in the departments. What is perhaps most interesting is that only 24 out of the 50 states participating in the survey allocate any research-related function to administrative units reporting directly to the chief state school officers. (See Table 50.) In some cases this is simply because a general deputy separates the top officer from the remainder of the department. In other cases it means that none of the several unit heads reporting to the chief is engaged in the research-based activities.

Coordination of RDDDE. The work of the administrative units performing research and development in state departments is coordinated only informally with that of other units in the departments and most of that is through the initiative of the various unit heads themselves. Over 40 percent of the respondents report that this is the case. Using

the department chief's cabinet as a coordinating device is almost as common (34 percent). Other devices include using coordinating committees, giving non-overlapping assignments to various units, and so on. Fifteen percent of the responding unit heads said that little or no coordination exists. (See Table 6.) That there are only negligible differences according to the RDDDE function being coordinated is shown in Table 7.

Given the fact that, in most instances, the functions are not originally allocated to the department units under a clear management plan, a higher degree of coordination would seem desirable. The lack of a visible pattern in the RDDDE projects surveyed, as reported later, is further evidence that better coordination is needed. Chapter 4, Commentary, advances a set of propositions about the kind of relationship which should exist between RDDDE functions and the programs being operated by state education departments.

Administrative Reorganization of RDDDE Units. It was hypothesized in undertaking this study that the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act in 1965 probably had a high impact on state RDDDE. The evidence in Table 8 offers partial confirmation. Although the reasons for the changes are not given, the table shows that over half of the units now performing RDDDE have been both reorganized and expanded since July 1, 1964. An additional 14 units have been either reorganized or expanded, leaving only 31 units untouched in the past six years. The site visits to the 12 states and the 9 regional meetings supplied numerous case illustrations of both reorganization and expansion, the majority of the

cases being tracable to the new requirements for evaluation and the new funds for state staffing brought in by the enactment of ESEA.

However, the most radical reorganizations identified during the site visits and the regional meetings were those commanded by state legislatures which had for some reason become thoroughly dissatisfied with the operation of the state education department and had sucessfully commanded changes from top to bottom. In such major reorganizations, RDDDE functions were swept into new and not always favorable patterns.

Financing RDDDE. Only 31 states responded to the survey question asking whether they received a regular allocation of state funds for RDDDE. Of the 31 which responded, over 80 percent received regular state funds for research and/or evaluation. At the other extreme, only 32 percent received regular funds for development. Dissemination and demonstration fell between the two extremes. (See Table 9.)

These data suggest that many administrative units in the departments are either authorized or obligated to carry out research, evaluation, and related functions as a normal part of their operations. This impression is confirmed by the evidence in Table 10, which shows the sources of authorization. The table shows, incidentally, that research is somewhat more likely to be authorized than any other function, while demonstration is somewhat less likely to be authorized. The table shows even more clearly that, for most of the 31 states supplying information, it is from their traditional budget allocations that the various administrative units draw funds for RDDDE. In only 12 states does the authorization appear in state law (most often for research) and in only

9 states does it appear as an act of the state board or chief state school officer.

A total of 33 states supplied data comparing state and federal funding sources for regular RDDDE activities. The figures appear in Table 11. The regular allotments are most likely to be earmarked for dissemination and least likely to be singled out for demonstration. This differs somewhat from regular federal allocations coming to the 33 departments. Federal funding is addressed to research, evaluation and dissemination about equally, with considerably less attention given to demonstration.

For each of the five RDDDE functions, state departments are more likely to receive regular funds from the federal government than from their own state legislatures (See Table 11.)

These same 33 states supplied a similiar comparision of state and federal funds which become available on specific occasions or for specific purposes and may not be repeated. State funds are more likely to be available for special research or development projects, least likely to be available for special evaluation projects. The number of states reporting any kind of special state funding ranges from 10% to 21% of the total number reporting. The states were considerably more likely to receive special project funds from the federal government, particularly for research. But for every category of RDDDE, special federal project funds were much more common than state funds. The number of states reporting such funds ranged from 27% to 42%. (See Table 12.)

Outside Affiliations. Some state education departments have stimulated the creation of an intra-state educational research council or similiar organization or have affiliated themselves in one way or another with a council created through non-department initiatives. These councils commonly count university personnel as well as local school personnel in their membership. Table 14 shows that only a minority of the 98 units responding to the survey maintain such intra-state affiliations. They report it is most common to do so for demonstration activities, least common to do so for evaluation activities. (See Table 13.)

In contrast, a clear majority of the 98 units reporting said they maintained some kind of affiliation with an inter-state organization, most often for evaluation (78%) and the least often for demonstration (60%). (See Table 13.)

Significantly, only two or three administrative units volunteered that they are affiliated with an institute of higher education or one of the research and development centers or regional education laboratories supported by the federal government. This finding is somewhat surprising, given the fact that these federally-supported centers and laboratories have been in existence since the mid-1960's and in some cases their research and development products are now being field tested in the schools.

The data suggest that state departments find it easier to relate to other state departments than to other kinds of administrative units

within their own states. This is doubtless explained in part by the intra-state partnerships created in response to ESEA Title V, Section 505, which supports multi-state projects. Nevertheless, it is not reassuring to find that even in 1970 less than one-third of the departments have been able to stimulate the creation of or even become linked to any within-state organization devoted to research and development.

RDDDE Functions

This section of the chapter characterizes the environment in which state RDDDE activities are now being conducted. It also deals with the relationship of RDDDE to planning, an increasingly significant department function, discusses technical assistance and systematic service to other department units and to local school districts, and presents data on trends in outside contracting for RDDDE services.

The Climate for RDDDE. The psychological climate for state department research is not especially healthful. Most respondents to the survey questionnaire labeled as "Sometimes true" or "Seldom true" the optimistic survey proposition that "there is interest in and support for educational research." In unsurprising contrast, 91% said that there should usually be such support. No matter how the questions about research support were phrased, they gave similar answers. Nearly all respondents said they believe that during fiscal retrenchment, research activity will be cut back before operational programs are reduced. (See Table 4, Item 13.) They were convinced that evaluation and assessment are considered more important in the department than

research and they called this unsatisfactory. (See Table 4, item 19.)

Moreover, the RDDDE administrators who reported said that research conducted within the department is usually not held in as high esteem as that conducted outside the department. By a very heavy majority, they said they believed that department research should be more highly regarded. (See Table 4, item 16.) Over half of the respondents indicated that the department is more likely to disseminate or to use research findings than it is to produce them. This may be linked to the fact that they saw the department as preferring the cultivation or use of outside research capabilities rather then the development of such capabilities. (See Table 4, item 9.)

The 98 unit heads answering the questionnaires have mixed views about whether their departments are likely to be "transmitters of research first, users second, and producers last." They testify to a quite varied situation in their departments today and their views are widely scattered on whether the actual pattern is in fact unsatisfactory. (See Table 4, item 10.)

The unit heads did not see the climate outside the department as being much more favorable toward state RDDDE than that inside the department. Almost all of those who expressed opinions agreed that educational organizations such as teachers' associations and federations, school board associations, PTA groups etc. do not give a high priority to research. In contrasting this to what they thought the external support climate for research should be, almost all who answered the questionnaire said that such outside groups should sometimes or usually give a high priority to research.

Administrative Constraints. Respondents were asked a series of questions about the influence of the state governor and legislature on RDDDE activity in state departments. The 12 site visits conducted preliminary to developing the mail survey questionnaire had indicated that this was of concern to state personnel. Responses to the questionnaire confirmed that hypothesis. A heavy majority of respondents agreed that the governor and the legislature in their states had a stronger interest in planning than in research. Many respondents evidently considered this an imbalance. A similar majority agreed that requests from the governor's office or the legislature were for evaluation and assessment data rather than for research findings. Again, a great many saw this as an imbalance. More respondents concurred that, unfortunately, those departmental program activities that do not readily lend themselves to the information requirements of the governor or the legislature are likely to suffer budgetary neglect. The example used compared the need for information about student transportation to the need for information about research findings. (See Table 4, items 22, 21, and 25.)

Respondents were also asked whether the governor's office or his administrative agents were imposing their information requirements on departmental research and whether this was causing programs in the department to be influenced by non-program considerations, such as quantifiability of need. A heavy majority of the respondents agreed that the governor or his agents did indeed impose their information needs on the department and that it sometimes did work to the disadvantage

of programs that could not be quantified. Indeed, a noticeable minority said that this was usually the case in their states. Roughly half of the respondents said they felt that the governors should not exert this kind of influence on departmental research or should do so only rarely. (See Table 4, items 20, 23 and 24.)

Persons interviewed during the site visits and at the regional meetings repeated the now-familiar list of constraints under which state department personnel must operate. These constraints of course affect the entire department, not the RDDDE operations alone. The list of difficulties included civil service regulations, the extreme slowness of administrative and personnel units to approve new professional positions at appropriate salary levels, political cross-fire between legislators and governors, highly restrictive legislative control over departmental organization and operations, low salary ceilings for governors and state superintendents under which everyone else has to crouch, and so on down a long list. Such constraints are of course serious even though familiar. They are particularly serious for RDDDE functions, where responsiveness, flexibility, and the need for highly specialized talents from time to time are probably greater than in the regular operation of department programs.

Short-range versus long-range studies. Respondents were asked a series of questions about decision-oriented research and about the time frame for such studies. Most respondents agreed that decision-oriented research arising in response to immediate pressing problems of manifest practicality usually predominates in the department. This was the only question out of 37 to which the respondents gave what might seem a

surprising answer. When asked whether this condition should obtain, a noticeable number said that the tendency to make useful, practical studies should in fact be accentuated. (See Table 4, item 7.)

On the other hand, most said that short-range decision studies usually take precedence over long-range decision studies, whereas a plurality said that this should only sometimes be the case. (See Table 4, item 8.)

The desire of unit heads to undertake state-funded studies with long-range or complex decision-making implications (such studies are federally funded at present, they indicated) shows up in another question. (See Table 4, item 11.)

In short, state RDDDE unit leaders do not oppose studies which are practical and useful--indeed, they would give even more attention to such studies--but they want the work to be conducted over a longer time period so that the findings inform more complex, far-reaching decisions. It also seem likely, judging from the personal interviews on site visits and at regional meetings, that the time allowed for the execution of such studies would be more merciful to the state RDDDE staff.

Statistical Support for RDDDE. Research requires data. NDEA Title X was intended to help all state education departments build a data-processing system which could serve the research arm of the department as well as other units engaged in making data-based investigations or decisions. The survey questionnaire cheerfully proposed that state departments have their data well in hand, using this statement along

with four others: "Large arrays of routinely-collected data are machine processed, electronically or mechanically stored, and can be readily retrieved." Not so, objected most of the 98 unit heads. Although 30% said these descriptions usually fit them, almost 70% said that this was seldom true or was true only some of the time. In contrast, 81% of the respondents said that it should usually be true. That much discrepancy between existing and desired conditions (30% as compared to 81%) was unusual in the survey results. (See Table 4, item 1.)

A similar state of dissatisfaction was exposed by other questions in the same series. Respondents said that data routinely gathered are not always available for special studies extending beyond those regularly undertaken, but there was little disagreement that this should usually be the case. Similarly, only half of the respondents said that they usually have budgetary provisions for data processing, in contrast to the 96% who thought that this should be usually be true. While nearly all respondents felt that their departments should be able to make routinely-gathered data readily available, and should be able to make special collections when necessary, fewer than 25% reported that this was usually the case, although 69% thought that it should be. Respondents were asked whether they could contract for outside services where the study demands were too extensive for regular departmental staff. Again, only 25% said that this was usually the case while 60% said that it should be the case. In short, many respondents were not satisfied with the statistical support services currently available to underpin RDDDE activities. (See Table 4, items 2,3,4, and 5.)

Unit heads were asked whether statistical support was available to support all research-related functions. Just under half said such support was available for research or evaluation, about one third said that it was available for development and dissemination, and about 20% said it was available for demonstration. Somewhat smaller percentages, but in the same relative proportions across RDDDE functions, said that the department's management information system or student information system was available to support the various research-related functions. (See Table 14.)

The Relation of Research to Planning. There is evidence on every hand that state education departments, perhaps following the federal lead, are becoming concerned about planning. In a number of states, the planning function is being bracketed with the research function into a single administrative unit, as became the case last year at the federal level, when the U.S. Office of Education merged planning, research, and evaluation functions into a single administrative unit. Thus, the survey set out to check the possibility that planning might be becoming a kind of "envelope" for research.

In response to several questions, respondents made it clear that as of 1970, the requirements of planners in the education department (or other state government agencies) do not usually determine research activities although the majority concurred that it happened some of the time. (See Table 4, item 18.) Most felt that research and planning are usually treated as related entities, yet most said that research seldom or only occasionally provides input for the planning process. (See Table 4, items 14 and 15.) This may be because planning is only an embryonic function

in state education agencies, or because the amount and type of research now being conducted by the departments cannot inform planning, or perhaps becuase of poor coordination between the two. Whatever the reason now, it seems highly desirable in the future that research results become useful to the planning process. Planners are potentially important clients for researchers in state departments.

A number of state department researchers reported that planning units have greater access to the upper levels of the departmental hierarchy than do the RDDDE units, but evidently the RDDDE heads do not find it especially objectionable. In fact, when asked directly whether planners are becoming an intervening layer between RDDDE practitioners and departmental policy-makers, a majority of the respondents said that this was at least sometimes the case but they did not register a strong protest. (See Table 4, items 27 and 28.) It is evident that RDDDE personnel tend to accept the concept that if planning becomes a significant state function, the planners are natural clients for the information generated by RDDDE personnel.

The questionnaire also asked whether research staff members were moving into planning roles within the department. This is sometimes the case, according to the reports, and the respondents think it should happen even more often. (See Table 4, item 30.)

Distribution of RDDDE Effort. Table 15 shows the number of RDDDE categories for which the 98 administrative units reported activity. Less than half of the units (43 of them) report being engaged in all five activities. About half that number (22 of them) say they are engaged in

four of the five activities, with demonstration being the least common area of effort. Another 16 units report working in three of the five areas, with least effort going into development and demonstration. And another 17 units report engaging in only one or two areas. (See Table 15.)

When the responses are totaled, it becomes clear that dissemination is the most common activity, followed fairly closely by evaluation, research, and development in that order, with demonstration being less common although it is nonetheless reported by 58 of the units.

Technical Assistance and Service to Others. State education departments have long felt obligated to serve the needs of local school districts and other education agencies. One way to serve in research and research-related functions is to provide technical assistance in helping others plan and evaluate their own work. Another is to provide direct service by actually designing and conducting studies for others.

The unit heads reported that requests from the field for evaluation are more common than requests for research, although they would themselves prefer a better balance. (See Table 4, item 20.)

Most respondents said they provide technical assistance to other units in the department and to outside agencies, especially in reviewing existing efforts, analyzing services needed, and helping implement projects. Department personnel are somewhat less likely to design service programs and are considerably less likely to train the staff of the other units or agencies. Respondents said they are most likely to

give help in evaluation, research, development, dissemination, and demonstration--in that order. The differences, however, are not very great, perhaps because state personnel do not make very sharp distinctions between RDDDE functions. (See Table 16.)

State RDDDE personnel are not as able to provide systematic, direct service as they are to provide occasional technical assistance, simply because they lack sufficient numbers of personnel. Table 17 shows the pattern of systematic service. The figures are considerably smaller than those shown in Table 16, but they are roughly proportional to those in Table 16 across RDDDE areas and across different kinds of service. The clientele served are almost identical in both cases: local school districts, other units within the department, intermediate school districts, non-governmental units such as teachers' associations, other state governmental units, and other intermediate or local governmental units--in that order. Assistance and service are given in evaluation, research, dissemination, development, and demonstration--in that order. (See Tables 19 and 20.)

Respondents were asked whether their units evaluated and disseminated information about RDDDE activities performed by agencies outside the department. About one-fifth said that they did so. (See Table 18.)

Outside Contracting. Approximately one-fourth of the states award contracts or otherwise grant RDDDE funds to outsiders, as shown in Table 21. Many of the grants are to local school districts to develop, evaluate, or demonstrate new instructional programs or to colleges and universities for conducting research or evaluation. Numerous examples of

such projects appear in the Project Catalogue in Appendix G and in the Project List in Appendix H.

Asked whether they prefer to cultivate or to use outside research capabilities rather than to develop them internally, half of the unit heads said that their departments sometimes or usually go outside. (See Table 4, item 9.)

Those states with an aggressive interest in outside contracting think that it is likely to grow. They cite several advantages, including these:

1. It is better to select from a wide range of specialized competencies via contracts rather than try to embody them in one person.
2. Contracting with outsiders eliminates the problem of having to find another slot for an employee after a short-term activity is completed.
3. Contracting is a way around the long delays of waiting for civil service appointments.

A few states reported having more success with consulting firms than with colleges and universities, where graduate students are often assigned the work but become inaccessible to control.

No matter who the contractor is, according to state RDDDE personnel, the activity is not trouble-free. They talked about the need for writing careful contract specifications, for intermediate checks on the progress of the work, for monitoring performance, and for accumulating knowledge about contractors' capabilities.

Staffing

Personnel problems in state education departments have long been a cause for lament. RDDDE personnel have never been an exception to the

general complaint, and are not now, although a number of the administrators interviewed said that they feel that the situation has improved somewhat recently. Department salaries are more competitive than in previous years and the work is more attractive than before. The data supplied by 354 people employed in state RDDDE activities in the 38 states represented in this survey are presented below.

Demographic Characteristics. The typical RDDDE state employee is a man in his thirties with a master's degree and one or two years experience in research and development who has directed or coordinated some special project in the past five years.

RDDDE personnel are well distributed in age from under 30 years to over 50 years. There seems to be a favorable clustering of personnel between age 31 and age 50, typically years of high energy tempered by experience. (See Table 22.)

Four out of five RDDDE personnel are men, showing a fairly good penetration of this specialized area of professional leadership on the part of women. (See Table 23.)

Almost 80% of the state personnel hold a Masters' Degree, with over 31% holding Doctors' Degrees. (See Table 24.)

Roughly one-third of those responding had exercised some kind of leadership in the past five years, as by directing a special project within the state or by holding a position of leadership in a regional or national professional organization. Presumably, some individuals had brought themselves to the attention of the state department through such leadership.

A majority appear to have gained most of their research and development experience while holding their current positions, as shown by comparing Tables 26 and 29.

Present Position Characteristics. The typical state RDDDE employee distributes his time over research, evaluation, dissemination, and development; spends part of his time in management and part in program; has been in his present position for about two years; is supported 100% either by federal cr state funds but not both; and is employed solely in the state education department.

The information in Table 27 demonstrates that very few state RDDDE personnel spend as much as 61% of their time carrying out any given function. Instead, their time is typically distributed over a number of different functions. It is far more common for a person to spend less than 21% of his time carrying out a function than it is for him to spend more than 61%. In much the same way that the project descriptions submitted during the survey do not fit neatly inside the boundaries set up by the definitions, there are virtually no state specialists who fit neatly inside those boundaries.

When the percentages shown in Table 27 are reduced to full-time equivalents, the distribution of effort over the five RDDDE functions becomes clear. Research, evaluation development, dissemination, and demonstrated are staffed in that order, but with the full-time equivalents in demonstration running about one-third of what they are in the other categories.

Table 28 shows that 66% of all respondents have a least some management duties, with 52% being at least half-time in management. This is

another way of demonstrating that there are a few full-time program specialists in state education departments. The data indicate that state personnel are more likely to manage RDDDE functions than to perform them.

Table 29 shows that almost 90% of all state RDDDE personnel have held their present position for four years or less. Thus, while they are relatively mature individuals, as shown earlier, they have only recently entered their present jobs. The reorganization and expansion of state RDDDE units since 1964, explained earlier, is consonant with this finding.

Table 30 suggests that roughly 35% of the respondents are not certain about the source of the funds which support them, if one can judge from the "no response" category. Of those who did respond most said they were supported either entirely by federal funds or entirely by state funds, but a substantial number drew support from both sources.

About 50% of the RDDDE personnel are supported by federal funds. This is not very different from the proportion of federal support for the remainder of state personnel. That figure would indicate that while the states are no less favorable to RDDDE than the federal government, they are no more favorable. (See Table 30.)

Table 31 shows that a total of 15 states have joined with some other organization during 1969-70 to arrange some form of joint appointment. Most of the joint appointments were arrangements with universities to have either faculty members or student interns work in the state departments. Some of these arrangements were semi-permanent and others

only temporary. The 15 states reporting joint appointments represent about 40 percent of the 38 states responding to the question.

Training. About one-third of the states provide some kind of training in research and development, usually for department personnel, but in some cases for local school personnel, ESEA Title III project staff, or other outsiders. Ordinarily a university faculty is involved in supplying the training, which sometimes leads to a higher degree for the department staff members. An occasional department provides paid study-leaves for staff improvement or reimburses staff members for university tuition charges.

Recruitment to State RDDDE Units. Most of the personnel interviewed during the study said that their departments continue to have difficulty in finding and adding skilled RDDDE staff members. About one-third of the RDDDE staff positions are filled by people who moved into their jobs from elsewhere in the department, half of them from another positon in the same office where they are now employed. Another 25 percent came into their positions from a local school district, 20 percent from a college or university, and the remaining 25 percent from a variety of other locations. (See Table 32.) Many of those interviewed said that new staff members brought into RDDDE units from other department units or from local school districts are seldom given substantial training for RDDDE tasks.

As they have for many years past; departments continue to draw upon the personal acquaintances of existing department personnel as a source of recruits. Even for positions in research and development, where

a somewhat more cosmopolitan and better-trained incoming group might be expected, 61 percent of the 353 respondents indicated that they had heard about their first position in the department from someone already or previously employed there. The remaining 39 percent heard about their jobs from various other sources. (See Table 33.)

Similarly, 65% said they were strongly influenced in their decision to join the department by a current or a former member. (See Table 34.) In fact, 38% indicated that the major source of influence on the respondent's decision to join the department was a personal friend. (See Table 35.) While one cannot criticize the loyalty to their organization which causes department members to recruit newcomers, one can question whether the kind of research and development talent needed in state education departments today can continue to be drawn so largely from the friends and acquaintances of the existing staff.

Recruitment from State RDDDE Units. Heads of administrative units were asked to supply data on all staff members who had left the departments during the previous year. The results are displayed in Tables 36, 37, 38, and 39.

Those who stayed in the departments are almost as well educated as those who left, judging from the data shown in Table 36. The proportion holding graduate degrees among those remaining does not differ appreciably from the proportion among those who are leaving.

Those leaving gave various reasons for their departure, sometimes more than one. The reason most commonly cited was career advancement,

with higher salary, more responsibility and personal reasons coming next in order. (See Table 37.)

Those who left were most likely to go to colleges or universities (29%) local school districts (18%) and consulting firms or private consulting (12%). A total of 8% of those who left moved to another office in the same education department, (See Table 38.)

Those whose left had been in the department for an average of only two years. (See Table 39.)

Projects

A total of approximately 450 project descriptions were collected from state education departments during the survey. Over 150 of them were chosen for abstracting into the Project Catalogue in Appendix G and over 100 of them were chosen for listing in the Project List in Appendix H. These descriptions constitute an excellent nationwide cross-section of the kind of research and research-related actitivites conducted and/or supported by state education departments today. This section of the chapter contains general comments on the character of those projects.

There are about as many research projects as all other types of projects combined. Among non-research projects, about as many are devoted to evaluation as to development and dissemination combined. There are very few demonstration projects. These findings are in keeping with what was shown earlier by the pattern of RDDDE financing and staffing. That is, research is the dominant activity and demonstration is a minor activity.

The studies in the Project Catalogue and in the Project List are designated as RDDDE according to the definitions used in the survey. The designations were made by IED staff on the basis of the written descriptions submitted. In most cases this required reducing the number of categories into which the respondent himself had placed the project. It was not unusual for projects to be submitted as belonging in three or four RDDDE categories but, upon inspection by the IED staff, to be placed in a single category. This is a further indication that ongoing activity in the field does not fall neatly within the boundaries established by the definitions used in the survey and indicates that state personnel do not conceive of project work as being divided into those categories.

Despite the fact that the respondents tended to place each project into several different RDDDE categories, very few of the project descriptions indicated that the work was part of a systematic plan to move projects through a linear series of stages. That is, the descriptions did not contain plans for applying research findings to develop new programs, for disseminating programs once they had been evaluated, and so on.

The intended audience for the research findings was not always clear. Whether the results were to be placed into a national pool of research findings on similar topics or whether certain decision-makers were waiting for immediate answers to their specific questions was not always evident.

Taken as a group, the projects did not appear to be directed to state-level or federal-level policy questions. There were, for example

almost no large-scale, multiple-state studies with an information base large enough to underpin a federal action. While a number of single projects are clearly intended to inform people who must make operational decisions, the implied decision-maker more often than not was a local board of education or perhaps a local school official. This may be traceable in part to the fact that many of the projects were state-supported rather than state-conducted. That is, they appeared to be field-initiated and were evidently carried out by local school districts or by college or university personnel, evidently to answer questions of interest to them.

Despite the fact that the projects frequently replicated each other, they did not fall into a pattern which would allow the ready aggregation of results into more substantial, more valid conclusions than could be based on a single study alone.

An appreciable number of the projects appeared to address questions far larger in scope than could be answered within the time and budget allocated to the work.

Projects costing less than $10,000 were not unusual. The fact that written reports are not available even for some completed projects suggests that they were probably authorized to inform some immediate decision, even though the findings may have had implications beyond the immediate purpose for which the study was being conducted.

Both the Project Catalogue and the Project List contain information to substantiate these characterizations.

Chapter 4

COMMENTARY

The Project Director has set aside this section of the report as a place to step back from the detailed findings in order to gain perspective on the whole body of data, to supplement the empirical evidence with subjective impressions gathered during the study and to draw on his general experience with state education departments. Thus what is said below is based not only upon the data presented earlier but also upon the Project Director's viewpoints and judgment.

Doubtless it is possible for a state education department to lead and to serve and to regulate schools without performing research and development.

It is possible for the state agency to convene able laymen and professionals to establish goals for the schools without actually studying what new kinds of learning are being demanded by current social changes. It is possible, as many states have demonstrated, to assemble curriculum development groups and to construct state curriculum guides with content and teaching techniques drawn out of professional experience rather than out of research. It is possible to invite professionals to state-sponsored conferences and to have them listen to interesting--if unvalidated--innovations described from the platform. It is possible for the state to sponsor and to advertise demonstration sites where what is being demonstrated has

not been proven superior to what the visitors left behind in their own schools. It is possible to send consultants or supervisors or inspectors across the state to offer schools advice without much scientific evidence to back it up.

It is possible to advise the governor and the legislature on the consequences of pending bills--or even to initiate legislation--without a firm prediction of the likely outcomes. It is possible to guide the state superintendent and the state board in adopting new regulations without being certain of their desirability of their effect. It is possible to evaluate and accredit schools on the basis of careful professional judgment based only on wisdom born of experience. It is possible to certify teachers, mandate the length of the school year, write specifications for buses and buildings, and disburse state funds without research underpinnings for any of the requirements. It is all possible--but none of it is desirable.

State leadership ought to stand on a foundation of knowledge. So should state service and so should state regulation. While no state department should be expected to supply single-handedly the full knowledge base it needs for guiding and executing state policy decisions--indeed, it would be both expensive and wasteful for every state to make such an attempt--every department might be expected to contribute something to that fund of knowledge. And it could reasonably be expected to do so partly at state expense rather than to do so entirely at federal expense.

State education departments have come out of the 1960's somewhat improved but not remade. Their ability to perform or pay for or stimulate research and development and related functions has been strengthened somewhat, largely at federal initiative and with federal funding. Yet no state education department enters the 1970's with a satisfactory organization for RDDDE or with sufficient staffing or with adequate funding, from either state or federal sources.

Something is fundamentally wrong. In the past century, state governments have time and again pioneered services which became models for the federal government to copy and extend nationwide. It has been true for agricultural experiment stations, for health services, for highway programs, for new kinds of welfare programs, and for many other endeavors. It has not been true for education.and it is not true today, even though education has become the most significant and expensive function of state government. It has not been true for educational research and development. For twenty years there has been no memorable state initiative in educational research and development.

From the federal government, on the other hand, (after Sputnik and some pump priming by philanthropic foundations) there came the curriculum reform movement in the early 1960's: university-based Research and Development Centers and the

Regional Educational Laboratories in the mid-1960's, ESEA Title III with its emphasis on innovation (albeit not research-based innovation) in the mid-1960's, and a number of major projects such as National Assessment in the same decade. The states have consistently moved second rather than first, and many have followed at a considerable distance.

The full set of reasons for reluctant state support of research and related functions in education would be difficult to identify and to rank accurately. However, there are two which are both clear and weighty.

First, state education departments evidently are not expected by governors and legislators to engage in reflective study or to make general contributions to the fund of research knowledge. Apparently they expect the departments to monitor, not to say govern, local school systems so that minimum standards are met, to assure local compliance with state statutes, to license teachers, and to disburse state and federal funds. Considerably higher aspirations for state education departments, articulated by professional leaders for over a century, have not caught the imaginations or changed the minds or loosened the purse strings of either the administration or legislature in most states.

Second, the research tradition in education, born and nurtured in university settings, has not yet produced a breed of men who have both the desire and the ability to turn scientific inquiry to the service of social policy decisions. That is, most state

education departments have not been able to locate or to train a cadre of researchers who have an intuitive sense of the kinds of questions a governor or a legislator are likely to ask, have command of techniques for giving data-based answers to those questions, and have the ability to convince their leaders of the need for such services.

It seems unlikely that continuing to conduct research-related activities in state departments as they have traditionally been conducted will change the situation appreciably in the next ten to twenty years. Governors and legislators are not likely to change their basic character. State departments are unlikely to change drastically. The utility of research-related activities for the profession is unlikely to shift enough to build a strong constituency for research-related activities. And the public impression of the value of what is being done--to the extent that it reaches public attention at all--is not likely to be altered. A new means will have to be found for carrying out research, development, and related functions in the present state atmosphere or those functions will have to continue to gasp for funds. For them to expand, or even to survive in good health, there may have to be drastic adjustments in the way RDDDE functions are carried out.

Perhaps what is needed is a new conception of what research and development ought to mean in state education departments--not in

universities or in research agencies or in local school systems, but in state education departments.

To provoke further thinking, the following set of propositions is offered. While they are not underpinned by solid empirical evidence, they do grow out of general findings of this survey. Most important, they are grounded in the belief that a state education department is a unique setting for research and development and that, to survive and grow in that setting, those functions must be uniquely fitted to it.

The term "research" will be used in this discussion in a broader sense than in the specific definition given to it in this survey. It will be used to denote not only the analysis of data for the purpose of making generalizations but also to denote the research-related activities which employ validated generalizations. That is, while the term research rather than RDDDE is used in the discussion, the context suggested for research applies equally to the related functions.

1) <u>The proper target of state education department research is not theory but improved practice</u>.

Two examples* typify state research:

> This pilot program tested the hypothesis that teaching Spanish-speaking children initially to read in Spanish while teaching them to speak English as a second language is a better means of assuring proficiency in reading than teaching them initially to read in English.
>
> The project studied several academic, attitudinal, and socio-economic variables in order to determine acceptable and desirable uses for the National Teacher Examination and other measurements of teacher behavior.

*All examples of projects are taken from Appendix G, Project Catalogue.

There is evidently an audience for the findings of such studies, either within the departments themselves or in the local school districts served by the departments. If research units could identify problems and decision situations faced by significant figures inside and outside the department and could address their investigations to them, the support environment for research and research-related activities could be improved.

2) The appropriate consequence of state education department research is not understanding but action.

This example is one of many:

> The purpose of the study was to determine the type of office machines now being used in selected businesses in the state and to gather data useful for curriculum revision for business education departments in public schools. . ..Results pointed to the need for new equipment, curriculum, and training programs . . . .

What was being sought in this investigation and dozens of others like it was not insight into educational processes but information to underpin specific operational improvements. While the data are presumably quite adequate for guiding action over the short term, they become obsolete over the long term, requiring that the survey be repeated.

To the extent that the potential actions can be envisioned before the studies are designed, data-collection can be focused and the findings made more useful.

3) The most suitable outcome is not a finding but a new law or regulation or advisory bulletin.

These three projects illustrate the search for such outcomes:

> The study was intended to correct the situation that industry cannot find locally qualified help while young people cannot find good jobs. . . Results enabled the study team to locate the problems and submit recommendations for legislative action.
>
> The project established climatic zones, identified utility rates, evaluated air conditioning systems, and established procedures for using such data for the purpose of air conditioning existing schools effectively and economically.
>
> State department personnel and members of the State Committee on School Entrance Age investigated and evaluated programs of early school admission, experimented with various testing techniques for school entrance and placement, and made recommendations for schools.

The traditional language of a state agency is the language of statutes, regulations, guidelines and, standards, although it is frequently supplemented by advice and suggestions. It seems reasonable for the state to express the results of its investigations in its customary language. And casting state department research findings in such language is one way of indicating that researchers understand and accept the environment in which they have elected to do their work.

4) <u>The correct mood is not reflection but a desire to reach the deadline before the pending decisions reach it.</u>

Traditionally, research sets its own timetables; usable findings are not scheduled to come forth at some fixed point in time. Indeed, they may never come forth at all. But state department researchers live in organizations where it is customary to marshall whatever evidence can be assembled before the fixed dates for decisions arrive. The decision dates are fixed; the information supply is allowed to vary according to the time and funds available to collect it. Information available before the date is useful; information available after it is not.

In such an atmosphere, the high-utility, high-influence studies will be those designed for completion before a decision deadline, compromising scope and certainty as necessary.

5) The natural clients are not members of the profession at large, but other administrative units within the state education department itself.

There are a number of reasons for this. One is the permanent state of competition among departmental units for scarce funds. By serving the decision needs of operating units, research personnel can strengthen their claim on the limited resources. Another is easier access to the decision circumstances of potential clients: the decision schedules and the decision criteria of department personnel are more readily available to department researchers than those of, say, local boards of education. Other reasons include easier access to data of interest to state decision-makers, convenient interaction with the client during the study, and so on.

A clear example of such an investigation is this one:

> The project assembled information to determine if schools constructed under a systems method were more functional, more adaptable, more economically or quickly built than were conventionally constructed schools.

6) The correct location is not the laboratory but either the library or the operating schools.

Very few of the research studies reported in the survey--and none of the development, demonstration, or evaluation projects--were located outside of elementary and secondary school settings. In fact, experimental studies are quite rare; most investigations examine ongoing

school programs operating under natural field conditions. Despite the many barriers this poses to scientific rigor, those difficulties seem to be more than offset by the gains in credibility enjoyed by field-based investigations, the tendency of such studies to select socially significant outcomes for measurement, and the easy extrapolation of the findings to other field settings.

7) The natural companion of a state department researcher is a state department planner.

As indicated earlier in Chapter 3, Findings, the stock of state planners was continuing to rise rapidly while this investigation was underway. In some states the planners were beginning to envelop the research function or else to be interposed between research units and top-level department decision makers. The conclusion that department researchers and planners can readily strike a symbiotic relationship is almost inevitable, given the first six propositions being advanced here. It is the business of planners to set up clear decision situations for executives, decision situations that clarify the task for a researcher who wants to make high-utility, high-influence studies. Conversely, it is the business of researchers to supply validated, data-based conclusions of the kind that planners need but rarely have available.

The best examples of research to underpin planning appear in the needs assessment studies, of which a great many were reported, some coming directly out of federal requirements that state plans for ESEA Title I and Title III programs be designed around established needs.

These phrases from several project abstracts convey the flavor of the work:

> This report, in response to legislative inquiry, described declining enrollments, instructional personnel, and state costs of the Catholic school system. . .
>
> This study identified eight areas of critical need and the potential populations to be served in each area. . .
>
> Demographic characteristics, residents' perceptions of educational needs, teaching practices, student achievement, and patterns of organization and administration were analyzed using a matrix of categories including population densities, geographic divisions, and economic factors.
>
> Sponsored and financed jointly by the departments of education and labor, this on-going project was begun to determine the need for vocational education. . . in rural communities.
>
> . . . Data from the findings are to be used for the establishment of an area vocational school.

8) The best research designs are not experimental but evaluative.

This proposition is little more than a direct reading of the survey results. The paucity of experimental studies was already discussed above. Rarely does a department-sponsored study contrive a special set of conditions to test hypotheses. On the other hand, "evaluative research" in which research-like techniques are used to assess (and occasionally to compare) ongoing programs is commonplace. The high utility of evaluative studies for decision makers inside and outside the department constitutes the strongest argument for their use by a department of education. There are the additional advantages of credibility of results, choice of socially significant outcomes, and easy extrapolation of findings all mentioned under proposition 6 above.

Appendix G, Project Catalogue, and Appendix H, Project List, both contain many examples of evaluation studies.

9) The proper kind of evidence to be gathered is subjective as often as it is objective.

Given the kinds of decisions made by state governors, by state department personnel and by state legislators, and given the criteria they use to make their decisions--criteria that include economy, ease of implementation, familiarity, conformance with established values, and public acceptance--there is more than one kind of evidence needed to guide those decisions. The testimony of those who would be affected by a pending policy decision, the advice of wise professionals, and the intuitive sense of well-placed people about any proposal need to be gather along with all the hard evidence.

Not surprisingly, this theme ran through a great number of the projects reported in the survey, as these excerpts from the abstracts in the Project Catalogue illustrate:

> . . .Each student supplied academic and demographic information, post-high school status, plans and activities, and his evaluation of guidance, subject instruction, and career preparation he had received in high school. . . .
>
> . . .Children and their parents had a favorable attitude toward school . . . .
>
> . . .In addition, reactions to the computer-assisted instruction were gathered by opinionnaire from students, teachers, and school administrators.
>
> . . .perceptions of parents, teachers and administrators regarding the school's avowed goals and their reactions to the school's programs. . . .
>
> . . .An opinionnaire, offering 25 statements about vocational-technical education, was sent to 190 industrial leaders and all state secondary school administrators. . . .

10) The appropriate criterion for judging the success of a program is not effectiveness but benefits in relation to costs.

Governors, budget officers, state legislators, professional planners, school boards and top-level state officals are very likely to be concerned about program costs in education and about whether benefits are in proportion to costs. State department researchers who are not sensitive to this concern on the part of policy makers, or who do not have techniques for relating outcomes to costs, are not ideally suited to the organizations that support them. The interest of state officials inside and outside the department in a particular educational approach may arise largely or even entirely from its promising cost/benefit ratio. Examples of such approaches can be found in the year-round school, the return of special education students to regular classrooms, instructional television, teacher aides and preschool programs, all of which are represented both in the Project Catalogue (Appendix G) and in the Project List (Appendix H).

11) The proper audience for a research report is those who make decisions about the operation of the schools.

It follows inexorably from earlier propositions that the findings of state-supported research ought to be transmitted to those in a position to take action pursuant to the findings. State personnel who write reports of their work may wish to write special versions addressed to their colleagues in research, but their primary audience will consist of non-researchers and their principal report ought to be designed accordingly. For example, decision makers are likely to prefer reports that have a ratio or methodology to findings, implications and recommendations of about

one to ten, rather than the reverse. That is, they will want to know a lot about what works and very little about how the researcher found out what works.

12) The appropriate media for reporting findings are not professional journals but the public press and radio and television.

State and local decision makers tend to be strongly influenced by their constituencies. This is especially true of elected officials such as governors and legislators, of course, but it is also true of top-level professionals such as state commissioners who work directly with lay boards of governors and it is true of their second-level and third-level assistants. Thus, in addition to couching his results and recommendations in non-research language for department and school executives, the researcher (and his sponsors) should seek ways to express his findings in a style and in a communication medium likely to reach the constituents whom top-level decision makers inside and outside the department must ultimately satisfy.

Unfortunately, the project reports collected during the survey contain virtually no examples of how results were effectively communicated to non-researchers through mass media or otherwise.

Conclusion

In short, the propositions add up to the notion that state education departments are distinctive environments for research and research-related functions. While they are not entirely inhospitable to those functions, they do constrain them greatly. To conduct RDDDE in state education departments requires that the constraints be recognized for what they are

and that the RDDDE be designed to go with the grain of the institution rather than to go against it or to proceed as though the mission of a state education department were no different, for example, from that of a university. The mission of a department is indeed unique. Those interested in conducting RDDDE must recognize it as such and carry out their work accordingly, even when that means some deviation from the norms for RDDDE conducted in other settings.

APPENDIX A

DEFINITIONS USED IN THE SURVEY

A SURVEY OF STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, DEMONSTRATION, DISSEMINATION, AND EVALUATION

1969-70

A study funded by the U. S. Office of Education and conducted by the

Institute for Educational Development
52 Vanderbilt Avenue
New York, New York 10017
212-686-8910

Project Director: Henry M. Brickell

DEFINITIONS FOR THIS SURVEY

Doubtless there is not complete agreement among state education officials as to the meaning of such terms as "research" and "development". Consequently, in order to gather comparable data from all states, it is necessary to define the key terms used in this study. We are not attempting to standardize or set forth an official vocabulary. In fact, we are also collecting the various definitions currently in use for these same terms (and other similar ones).

The definitions used in this survey appear below. We ask you to use them in responding to the questionnaire. Note what has been excluded as well as what has been included.

RESEARCH is defined as the anlysis of data for the purpose of making generalizations. The analysis may be simple or complex, but it must be some kind of search for generalizations. The generalizations may be about trends over time, relationships among variables, similarities and differences among groups (such as types of pupils or teachers or schools) or any other general statements about what the data reveal. The generalizations may of course be based on statistics computed to guide statistical inferences.

Surveys are considered research if, but only if, they embody a search for generalizations based on the data gathered.

Research may be performed either upon data gathered by the researcher for specific use in his study or upon data gathered by someone else for general use.

Research includes "library research" in which research findings are assembled from the literature, synthesized, and interpreted or used to derive implications for further research or for practice.

May, 1970

EXCLUDE the normal collection of general-purpose statistics or facts, that is, the traditional, often periodic, gathering of information of the kind typically published in statistical abstracts and annual state reports, where information is tabulated but not analyzed. (As defined here, to "analyze" means to search for generalizations.)

The normal collection of general-purpose statistics or facts incorporates these activities: inspecting reported figures for reasonableness, checking computations for accuracy, comparing data to a standard, computing descriptive statistics such as averages, classifying institutions on the basis of information reported, disbursing funds to or making other formula-based decisions about schools, and publishing statistics. Activities like these are not defined as analysis of data and are not to be reported.

It it important to distinguish between the normal collection of general-purpose statistics, when data are gathered but not analyzed, and the gathering of information for analysis as an integral part of research. Only the second type of data-gathering should be reported as research.

DEVELOPMENT is defined as the systematic use of research-based generalizations to create new educational methods, systems, materials, or devices which have practical utility. Included in development are the design and production of prototype processes and materials and also pilot trials to test their feasibility and to gather ideas for their improvement. Development may be used to generate new curriculum materials, new teaching techniques, new types of media, new ways of assigning pupils to schools, new architectural designs, and so on.

To meet this definition of development, such activities as planning programs, organizing courses of study, writing pupil materials and teachers' guides, or developing new instructional devices must be accompanied by research either before or during the development effort.

DEMONSTRATION is defined as the deliberate display-in-action of new methods, systems, materials or devices which are the products of research-based development. Demonstrations are for the purpose of showing the characteristics of new methods and materials to persons who might want to adopt or adapt them.

Demonstrations may be held in real operating settings such as schools or in other settings where conditions of actual use can be replicated. Simulation techniques are included if, but only if, they duplicate conditions of actual use. The audience may travel to the demonstration or the demonstration may be taken to the audience.

Included are the sponsored display-in-action of such methods and materials as classroom teaching techniques, counseling procedures, instructional equipment, management information systems, and school building designs—but only when they are the products of research-based development.

Passive exhibits of materials, equipment, or facilities are not to be included because they are not conducted under conditions of actual use.

Do not include any training which accompanies demonstration.

DISSEMINATION is defined as the sending of information either about the results of research or the products of development or the methods and materials being demonstrated. Included are all forms of information transmission, as by consultation or other face-to-face communication, telephone calls, individual letters, newsletters, bulletins, brochures, booklets, manuals, films, recordings, exhibits, brief conferences, and short meetings—but only when the information is about research, development, or demonstration as defined here.

Do not include those intensive or long interchanges intended not merely to inform an audience but rather to develop other persons' skills in using methods and materials and which actually constitute training.

EVALUATION. The term evaluation seems to be undergoing radical redefinition in some quarters today. Thus it is difficult to form a definition which incorporates the extremes of its current meanings. Perhaps evaluation defined as "the gathering and processing of information to guide decision-making" would cover the entire range of meanings.

If those several meanings are arranged as shown below, some seem closer to the meaning of research as defined in this survey while others seem further away. For this survey of state R&D, include A & B (the research-like activities) but exclude C & D (the non-research activities).

A	B	C	D
← RESEARCH ACTIVITY		NON-RESEARCH ACTIVITY →	
Tracing events to their causes	Determining the effects of treatments	Observing and judging on-going programs	Comparing data to a standard
EXAMPLES	**EXAMPLES**	**EXAMPLES**	**EXAMPLES**
Identifying the factors behind student unrest	Measuring the learning gain from a television series	Conducting a site visit to an ESEA Title III project	Accrediting schools Certifying teachers Monitoring school spending
Exploring the origins of teachers' unions	Comparing the outcomes of three teaching methods	Interviewing parents of children in classes for the handicapped to get their opinions about program success	

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRES USED IN THE SURVEY

INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

52 VANDERBILT AVENUE, NEW YORK, N.Y. 10017

212-686-8910

As you perhaps know by now, the Institute for Educational Development is making a national survey of state education department research, development, demonstration, dissemination and evaluation with USOE support. Initiated by a number of state department research directors, this work has had the benefit of their guidance from its inception.

The questionnaires for you and your staff are enclosed. As the head of an administrative unit engaged in RDDDE (see Definitions for This Survey) we are asking you to be responsible for their distribution within your department, their collection, and their return to us.

The questionnaires are organized into packets. Note that each unit head is to distribute questionnaires to individual staff members and to individual project heads.

CONTENTS OF EACH PACKET

Number of Copies	Color	Questionnaire	Respondent
1	Blue	Survey form	Head of each administrative unit engaged in RDDDE
1	Green	Budget Section	Head of each administrative unit engaged in RDDDE
1	White	Definitions for This Survey	Head of each administrative unit engaged in RDDDE
10	Buff and White	Individual Questionnaire - Personal and Professional Background with attached copies of Definitions for This Survey	Every person spending 50 percent of his time in RDDDE for at least four months each year
10	Orange and White	Project or Activity Report with attached copies of Definitions for This Survey	Every project or on-going activity director

SURVEY OF STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, DEMONSTRATION, DISSEMINATION & EVALUATION (RDDDE)

1969-70

Institute for Educational Development
52 Vanderbilt Avenue
New York, New York 10017
212-686-8910

Project Director: Henry M. Brickell

This survey form is to be completed by the person in charge of the administrative unit being surveyed. Please provide the following information:

Full name of person in charge

Mr. _____
Mrs. _____
Miss _____

_____
(Last) (First) (Initial)

Title _____

Administrative unit _____

_____ Telephone _____

State education department _____

Address _____
(City) (State) (Zip Code)

Full name of person providing this information, if different from person in charge

Mr. _____
Mrs. _____
Miss _____

_____
(Last) (First) (Initial)

IMPORTANT:

Please distribute immediately the individual personnel forms and project forms accompanying this blank. See pages 2 and 3 for instructions.

PLEASE DISTRIBUTE

INDIVIDUAL QUESTIONNAIRES – PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL BACKGROUND

Included with this form are individual questionnaires to be completed by each technical or professional staff member in this administrative unit who is presently engaged in RDDDE activity at least half of his time during at least four months per year; i.e., a summer employee who spends more than half his time in RDDDE (or any combination) but who is employed less than four months would not complete the form.

Please assist us by performing the following steps:

Step 1: List all such technical and professional persons who are to receive the questionnaires.

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____
5. _____
6. _____
7. _____
8. _____
9. _____
10. _____

Step 2: To each person named above, distribute the individual questionnaire with a copy of the RDDDE definitions attached.

Step 3: Collect and return to us a completed individual questionnaire for each person named in step #1 when you return the entire survey questionnaire (Please copy extra blank forms if needed.)

PLEASE DISTRIBUTE

PROJECT OR ACTIVITY REPORTS

Included with this form is a set of project or activity report blanks. Please have the director of each project or activity complete a blank for:

1. Each project or activity initiated on or after July 1, 1964, whether completed or still underway. NOTE: Exclude activities completed prior to June 30, 1964.

2. Each project or activity begun before July 1, 1964, but still underway.

3. Each project or activity presently being planned.

Not every RDDDE activity in the department or in this administrative unit may be considered a "project" with fixed beginning and ending dates. A more suitable designation may be "on-going" activity. Some of this "on-going" RDDDE activity can be and should be reported. For example, one such "on-going" activity may be periodic assessments of educational needs using research rigor for benefit of local, regional, state and national audiences or educational decision makers.

Please assist us by performing the following steps:

Step 1: List all projects and activities which are to be reported.

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____
5. _____
6. _____
7. _____
8. _____
9. _____
10. _____

Step 2: Distribute the forms with a copy of the RDDDE definitions attached.

Step 3: Collect and return the forms when you return the entire survey questionnaire. (Please copy extra blank forms if needed.)

I. Administrative Structure

A. Official names of administrative units

Name of administrative unit for which data are supplied:

1. _____

List, in order, the successively higher administrative units within the department which contain the unit. The final entry should be the office of the department's chief executive.

2. _____
3. _____
4. _____
5. _____
6. _____
7. _____
8. _____

B. Official titles of personnel

List, in order, the titles of the personnel in the office of the department's chief executive through whom this unit reports to the chief executive (e.g., Deputy Commissioner):

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____

C. Effects of reorganization, if any

1. Have you had one or more major department reorganizations that affected this administrative unit since July 1, 1964 (e.g., combining Planning, Research and Evaluation)?
"Yes" or "No" _____

2. Was this administrative unit expanded or reduced in size since July 1, 1964 as a result of the reorganization (rather than through a continuous process of regular change)?
"Yes" or "No" _____

3. If response was "Yes" to either or both questions, please explain in a brief note how reorganization affected the functions, budget, and staffing of the unit. (Use as many additional sheets as are needed.)

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

II. Description of 1969-70 RDDDE Activities

General Instructions

Check the appropriate cells (✓) after each of the following partially completed statements. More than one cell may be checked to complete a numbered statement. The last two questions in this section (Q and R) provide for open-ended responses in the event the previous fifteen multiple choice options do not accurately cover your department's activity.

A. According to the definitions used in this survey, which of the following activities takes place?

		Research (R)	Development (DV)	Demonstration (DM)	Dissemination (DS)	Evaluation (E)
1.	In this administrative unit	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
2.	In other administrative units in the department	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

Please list below the name of the other administrative units, along with the names and titles of the chief officers:

_____

_____

_____

_____

B. How is coordination within the department accomplished for RDDDE?

		(R)	(DV)	(DM)	(DS)	(E)
1.	By department chief's cabinet	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
2.	By departmental coordinating committee	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
3.	By specific and non-overlapping assignments to different units	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
4.	By unit heads, informally	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
5.	Other (specify)	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

_____

_____

6.	Little or no coordination exists	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

C. Is the department affiliated (officially represented — not just individual staff memberships):

		(R)	(DV)	(DM)	(DS)	(E)
1.	With an interstate organization or endeavor for	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

		(R)	(DV)	(DM)	(DS)	(E)
2.	With a within-state educational council or similar organization for	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
3.	Other (specify)	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

Note: The distinction between technical assistance and systematic service in the next four sections (D,E,F,G) is that technical assistance is seldom more than advice whereas systematic service means a sustained operational commitment along with the use of substantially greater resources. Systematic service would be doing RDDC or E for or with the outside agent rather than advising him in how to do RDDDE.

D. Is technical assistance available from this unit upon request for such services as:

		(R)	(DV)	(DM)	(DS)	(E)
1.	Review of existing efforts in	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
2.	Analysis of service needed in	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
3.	Design of service program in	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
4.	Training of staff in	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
5.	Help to implement projects or activity in	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
6.	Other (specify)	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

E. If technical assistance is provided, to whom?

		(R)	(DV)	(DM)	(DS)	(E)
1.	To other units within the department	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
2.	To regional, intermediate or multi-district educational units	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
3.	To local school districts	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
4.	To other state governmental units	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
5.	To other intermediate or local governmental units	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
6.	To non-governmental units such as teacher organizations, nonpublic schools, etc. (specify)	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

F. Is systematic service (requiring a substantially greater resource commitment than does technical assistance) available upon request to other departmental units or outside agencies for:

		(R)	(DV)	(DM)	(DS)	(E)
1.	Evaluation of existing programs in	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
2.	Determination of program needs in	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
3.	Training of program staff in	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
4.	Actual program implementation in	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
5.	Other (specify)	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

_____

_____

G. If systematic service is provided, to whom?

		(R)	(DV)	(DM)	(DS)	(E)
1.	To other units within the department	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
2.	To regional, intermediate or multi-district educational units	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
3.	To local school districts	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
4.	To other state governmental units	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
5.	To other intermediate or local governmental units	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
6.	To non-governmental units such as teacher organizations, nonpublic schools, etc. (specify)	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

_____

_____

		(R)	(DV)	(DM)	(DS)	(E)
H.	Other than upon request, does the unit systematically evaluate activity undertaken or completed by other agencies, commercial organizations, etc. If so, explain	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

_____

_____

		(R)	(DV)	(DM)	(DS)	(E)
I.	Other than upon request, does the unit systematically disseminate the results of activity undertaken or completed by other agencies, commercial organizations, etc. If so, explain	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

_____

_____

		(R)	(DV)	(DM)	(DS)	(E)
J.	Does the unit use any other means of stimulating program activity outside the department in	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

If so, explain

_____

_____

		(R)	(DV)	(DM)	(DS)	(E)
K.	Does the department have a statistical service unit (or units) which actively supports activity in	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
	_____	(R)	(DV)	(DM)	(DS)	(E)
L.	Does the department have a management information system (MIS) or student information system (SIS) – itemized data on students, teachers, supportive personnel – etc. (as distinct from a statistical unit) which supports activity in	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
		(R)	(DV)	(DM)	(DS)	(E)
M.	Does the department receive a regular or biennial allocation of state funds expressly designated for RDDDE?	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

N. If state funds are regularly allocated, are the allocations authorized through:

		(R)	(DV)	(DM)	(DS)	(E)
1.	State law (if so, specify beneath appropriate function the year the initial law was passed)	____	____	____	____	____
2.	State board and/or Commissioner's (department head's) regulations	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
3.	Traditional budget allocations to various administrative units	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
4.	Other means (please describe)	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

_____

_____

		(R)	(DV)	(DM)	(DS)	(E)
O.	Does the department through grant awards or contracts dispense state funds for	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

P. If so, to whom/and in what dollar amount (in $1,000) during 1969-70?

		Total	(R)	(DV)	(DM)	(DS)	(E)
1.	Local school districts		( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
	Amounts:	$____	$____	$____	$____	$____	$____
2.	Intermediate, county or regional education units		( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
	Amounts:	$____	$____	$____	$____	$____	$____

		Total	(R)	(DV)	(DM)	(DS)	(E)
3.	Colleges or universities		( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
	Amounts:	$___	$___	$___	$___	$___	$___
4.	R & D Centers or Regional Laboratories		( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
	Amounts:	$___	$___	$___	$___	$___	$___
5.	Other units of government (specify)		( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
	Amounts:	$___	$___	$___	$___	$___	$___
6.	Non-governmental units (specify)		( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
	Amounts:	$___	$___	$___	$___	$___	$___

Q. Please provide any general information or specific comments which you feel would be helpful toward understanding your state's RDDDE present activities. Use as many additional sheets as are necessary.

R. Additionally, please provide any general information or specific comments which would be helpful toward understanding your state's planned RDDDE activities. Use additional sheets as are necessary.

III. Recent Personnel Separations

Check the appropriate cells (✓) for each professional and technical staff member formerly engaged in RDDDE (see definitions) who left this administrative unit since July 1, 1969. Names are not necessary but position titles and the education levels of the separated persons are.

Separated staff members' titles	Length of service in this administrative unit was: Years	Months
# 1		
# 2		
# 3		
# 4		
# 5		

(PLEASE PHOTOCOPY THIS SHEET IF n>5)

Separated staff member went into (check one):

	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5		
A.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	A.	This state education department but to another office
B.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	B.	Another state education department
C.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	C.	A school district
D.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	D.	A college or university
E.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	E.	A philanthropic foundation
F.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	F.	A regional or national R & D organization
G.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	G.	Special project activity, such as a national curriculum project or federally funded activity (ESEA I, III, V, VEA, etc.,)
H.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	H.	A consulting firm or private consultancy
I.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	I.	Do not know

Separated staff member left this administrative unit for (check as many as apply):

	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5		
J.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	J.	Career advancement
K.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	K.	Higher salary
L.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	L.	More responsibility
M.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	M.	Study toward an advanced degree
N.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	N.	Personal reasons
O.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	O.	Retirement (or deceased)

	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5		
P.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	P.	Involuntary termination
Q.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Q.	Do not know

Separated staff member's educational level was (check one):

	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5		
R.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	R.	Post high school
S.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	S.	Bachelor
T.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	T.	Master
U.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	U.	Doctor
V.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	V.	Post-doctorate

IV. Secretarial and Clerical Personnel

What is the total number (full-time equivalent) of secretarial and clerical personnel in this unit assigned to RDDDE activities?

Number_____

V. Multiple Appointments

Some departments jointly employ RDDDE personnel with outside agencies such as universities or R & D centers. If you have such personnel, please describe the arrangements briefly below (exclude all occasional consultants).

VI. Training

Please describe any especially interesting or effective training of specialists in research, development, demonstration, dissemination, or evaluation either sponsored or carried on by this administrative unit.

VII. Observations and Opinions

General Instructions

This section of the RDDDE survey seeks your knowledge as to whether the statements made are true of your department or not. This section also seeks your opinion as to whether the same statements should or should not be true of your department. Please enter to the left of each item the number of the answer which best describes your informed knowledge of the situation in your department – and to the right of each item the number of the answer which best describes your opinion of what the situation should be.

A. Knowledge	B. Opinion
(1) Usually (2/3 or more of the time)	(1) Should usually be true
(2) Some of the time (1/3 to 2/3)	(2) Should sometimes be true
(3) Seldom (1/3 or less)	(3) Should seldom be true
(4) Do not know	(4) No opinion

( )	1.	Large arrays of routinely collected data are machine processed, electronically or mechanically stored and can be rapidly retrieved.	1.	( )
( )	2.	Data routinely gathered are available for special studies, analyses or reports extending beyond those regularly undertaken.	2.	( )
( )	3.	Where data routinely collected on a state-wide basis are inadequate for special-purpose studies, special data collections are easily authorized and undertaken.	3.	( )
( )	4.	There are budgetary provisions for data gathering, processing, manipulation and analysis.	4.	( )
( )	5.	Where data or study demands are too extensive for regular departmental staff, contracts for outside services are used.	5.	( )
( )	6.	Research or studies with long-range or complex decision-making implications are contracted out to consulting firms, universities, R and D centers, etc.	6.	( )
( )	7.	Decision-oriented research or activities (arising in response to an immediate pressing problem or having manifest practicality) predominate in the department.	7.	( )
( )	8.	Short-range decision studies or information needs predominate and take precedence over long-range decision studies.	8.	( )
( )	9.	The department prefers to cultivate or to use outside research capabilities rather than to develop them internally.	9.	( )
( )	10.	The department is a transmitter of research first, a user second and a producer last.	10.	( )
( )	11.	Research or studies with long-range or complex decision making implications are more likely to be funded with federal than with state funds.	11.	( )
( )	12.	There is interest in and support for educational research.	12.	( )

Knowledge			Opinion	
( )	13.	During fiscal retrenchments, research activity is cut back before operational programs are.	13.	( )
( )	14.	Research and planning are treated as related entities.	14.	( )
( )	15.	Research provides input for departmental planning.	15.	( )
( )	16.	Research conducted within the department is held in as high esteem as that undertaken outside the department.	16.	( )
( )	17.	Field requests are for planning and development help first, research last.	17.	( )
( )	18.	Planning and development needs determine research activities.	18.	( )
( )	19.	Evaluation and assessment are considered more important than research.	19.	( )
( )	20.	Requests from the field for evaluation and assessment are more common than those for research.	20.	( )
( )	21.	Requests from the governor's office or the legislature are for evaluation and assessment rather than for research.	21.	( )
( )	22.	The governor's and legislature's interest in planning is greater than their interest in research.	22.	( )
( )	23.	The governor's office or his administrative agents are imposing their information requirements or information generating procedures on research activity.	23.	( )
( )	24.	One result of this imposition is that departmental program activity is influenced by non-program considerations; for example, quantifiability of need.	24.	( )
( )	25.	Some program activities that do not readily lend themselves to the governor's or legislature's information requirements suffer from budgetary neglect -- research needs, for example, as compared to student transportation needs.	25.	( )
( )	26.	A management plan determines RDDDE placement throughout the department.	26.	( )
( )	27.	Planning units have greater access to the departmental hierarchy than do RDDDE units.	27.	( )
( )	28.	Planners are becoming (or are now) an intervening layer between RDDDE practictioners and departmental policy-makers.	28.	( )
( )	29.	Many planning, coordinating and managing procedures are being used or implemented within the department without adequate evaluation or testing.	29.	( )
( )	30.	Research staff are moving into planning roles within the department.	30.	( )
( )	31.	Educational organizations -- such as teachers' associations and federations, school board associations, PTA groups, etc. -- give a high priority to research.	31.	( )
( )	32.	Management studies of departmental operations propose (or have done) much to alter the department's research and development structure.	32.	( )
( )	33.	Consolidated reports and information needs -- on both state and federal levels -- are altering or have potential to alter departmental RDDDE structure.	33.	( )

Knowledge			Opinion
( )	34.	Skilled RDDDE staff are readily available.	34. ( )
( )	35.	Departmental or school-district-recruited employees are being "retooled" for RDDDE responsibilities.	35. ( )
( )	36.	Professional field agents are employed by the department to carry out RDDDE program activities in the field.	36. ( )
( )	37.	Professional agents affiliated with other agencies, e.g., colleges and universities and not in the departmental employ, are available and used to carry out departmental RDDDE activities in the field.	37. ( )

VIII. Additional Observations and Opinions

The 37 items above were derived from site visits to a dozen state education departments. Are there two or three other general observations—especially about DDDE—you would like to report?

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

IX. Other Definitions of RDDDE

If you use definitions of the terms research, development, demonstration, dissemination, and evaluation which differ significantly from those used in this survey, please record them below. Add and define other terms you frequently use in discussing research and development if you find them clarifying and useful. Use additional pages if necessary.

BUDGET SECTION

Survey of State Education Department
Research, Development, Demonstration,
Dissemination & Evaluation
(RDDDE)
1969-70

Name of administrative unit reporting: _____

Approximately what amount of the budget of this administrative unit fell into each of the following categories? Exact figures are not necessary. Please use estimates rounded out to the nearest thousand. Dollar amounts for the various RDDDE functions can be estimated from percentages of staff time spent. These statistics will be used solely to identify allocation of effort and are not for financial accounting. Supply totals even if details are not available.

Use the RDDDE definitions employed in this survey.

1969-70

	RESEARCH (in $1,000)	DEVELOPMENT (in $1,000)	DEMONSTRATION (in $1,000)	DISSEMINATION (in $1,000)	EVALUATION (in $1,000)	OTHER THAN RDDDE (in $1,000)	TOTAL (in $1,000)
Regular funds							
State							
Federal							
Other (please specify)							
_____							
_____							
_____							
TOTAL REGULAR FUNDS							
Special project funds budgeted for spending DURING 1969-70							
State							
Federal							
Philanthropic foundation							
Other (please specify)							
_____							
_____							
_____							
TOTAL SPECIAL FUNDS							
TOTAL REGULAR AND SPECIAL FUNDS							

INDIVIDUAL QUESTIONNAIRE
PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL BACKGROUND

Survey of State Education Department
Research, Development, Demonstration,
Dissemination & Evaluation
(RDDDE)

1969-70

Instructions

This survey of personnel attributes is designed only for those persons engaged more than half-time in Research, Development, Demonstration, Dissemination and/or Evaluation activities as defined for the purposes of this study. Please refer to the definitions of these terms before completing item #1.

1. Present position

Is at least 50% of your present time, according to the definitions, devoted to one or more of the following?

Please indicate the percentage of time allocated to each area:

( )	Research	_____% of time involved
( )	Development	_____% of time involved
( )	Demonstration	_____% of time involved
( )	Dissemination	_____% of time involved
( )	Evaluation	_____% of time involved
	Total	_____% of time involved

IF LESS THAN 50% OF YOUR TOTAL TIME IS DEVOTED TO THIS GROUP OF ACTIVITIES, PLEASE DO NOT FILL OUT THIS QUESTIONNAIRE.

If you are eligible, please provide the following information.

Full name: Mr. ____ Mrs. ____ Miss ____ _____ (Last) _____ (First) _____ (Initial)

Title: _____

Your administrative unit: _____

_____ Telephone: _____

Address: _____

_____
(City) (State) (Zip Code)

Institute for Educational Development, 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017

Please place a check mark in the appropriate cell (✓) beneath each of the following headings or partially completed statements.

2. Sex

( ) Male
( ) Female

3. Age

( ) 30 or under
( ) 31-40
( ) 41-50
( ) Over 50

4. Educational level (check one or more)

	Year completed	Field of specialization
( ) Post high school	_____	_____
( ) Bachelor	_____	_____
( ) Master	_____	_____
( ) Doctor	_____	_____
( ) Post-doctorate	_____	_____

5. Present position (check one)

( ) Professional, 100% of time devoted to management or administrative work
( ) Professional, 75% of time management or administrative, 25% program*
( ) Professional, 50% of time management or administrative, 50% program*
( ) Professional, 25% of time management or administrative, 75% program*
( ) Professional, 100% of time devoted to program*
( ) Technician or specialist

*Actual involvement in RDDDE activity as distinct from administering, managing or monitoring other persons' RDDDE activities.

6. Time in present position (check one)

( ) Less than 1 year
( ) 1-2 years
( ) 3-4 years
( ) 5-6 years
( ) 7-8 years
( ) 9-10 years
( ) 11-15 years
( ) More than 15 years

7. Funds for position

_____% State funds
_____% Federal funds (specify) _____
_____% Philanthropic foundation funds _____
_____% Other (specify) _____

8. Previous position was in (check one)

( ) This same office, but in another position
( ) This state department, but in another office
( ) Another state department
( ) A school district
( ) A college or university
( ) A philanthropic foundation
( ) A regional or national R&D organization (REL or R&D Center, for example)
( ) Special project activity, such as national curriculum projects or other federally funded project activity (ESEA I, III, V, VEA, etc.)
( ) Other (specify) _____
( ) None

9. How did you first hear of your first position in the department?

( ) From a member in the department
( ) From a former member in the department
( ) From a placement service
( ) From a professor
( ) From local school district personnel
( ) Other (specify) _____
_____

10. Who strongly influenced your decision to join the department? (Check one or, if more than one was involved, use numbers (1, 2 . . . N) to indicate order of influence

( ) A member in the department
( ) A former member in the department
( ) A placement advisor
( ) A professor
( ) A local school district person
( ) Other (specify) _____

_____

11. Was the most influential person checked above a personal friend?

( ) Yes ( ) No

12. Total work experience in RDDDE as defined (check one or more)

( ) Research	Full-time equivalent years _____
( ) Development	Full-time equivalent years _____
( ) Demonstration	Full-time equivalent years _____
( ) Dissemination	Full-time equivalent years _____
( ) Evaluation	Full-time equivalent years _____

13. Activities during past five years (check as many as apply)

( ) Developed a multi-state project or activity, such as those funded under ESEA Title V—505 or with foundation funds

( ) Directed or coordinated a multi-state project or activity

( ) Directed or coordinated a special project within the state using funds from other than state sources

( ) Held a position of leadership in a regional or national professional organization or activity

( ) Other (specify) _____

_____

PROJECT OR ACTIVITY REPORT

Survey of State Education Department
Research, Development, Demonstration,
Dissemination, & Evaluation
(RDDDE)

1969-70

Instructions

Report only one project or activity on each form. (The head of your administrative unit can supply you with additional copies if necessary.) Include only a project or activity which:

1. Was initiated on or after July 1, 1964. It may be completed or still underway.

2. Was started before July 1, 1964, and is still underway.

3. Is planned for initiation during the 1970-71 school year.

Not every RDDDE activity in the department or in this administrative unit may be considered a "project" with fixed beginning and ending dates. A more suitable designation may be "on-going" activity. Some of this "on-going" RDDDE activity can be and should be reported. For example, one such "on-going" activity may be periodic assessments of educational needs using research rigor for benefit of local, regional, state and national audiences or educational decision makers.

In responding to the items on this questionnaire, read and refer to the definitions of RDDDE used for this survey.

1. Title of project: _____

2. Sponsoring administrative unit: _____

3. Project or activity being performed by (check one — if more than one is checked please explain):

   ( ) State department personnel ( ) Outside contractor ( ) Master degree or doctoral candidate

4. Name and title of project or activity director: _____

5. Name, title, and administrative unit of person completing this report, if different from above:

6. Type of project: (check more than one if necessary)

( ) Research
( ) Development
( ) Demonstration
( ) Dissemination
( ) Evaluation
( ) This project or activity does not fit any of the survey definitions but it is worth reporting since it is in the domain of research, development and related activities.

Of the following two categories, are you reporting on:

( ) A project
( ) An on-going activity

7. What person or event initiated this activity? _____

_____

_____

8. Starting date: _____ Ending date: _____

9. Total project budget: $ _____
or annual funding level if an "on-going" activity:

YEAR	AMOUNT
_____	$ _____
_____	$ _____
_____	$ _____
_____	$ _____
_____	$ _____

10. Is a project report available? ( ) Yes ( ) No

Name source, if other than this administrative unit: _____

_____

_____

11. Brief description of project continue on back of form if necessary):

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

APPENDIX C

PERSONS ARRANGING SITE VISITS TO STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION 1969-'70

CALIFORNIA	- February 24, 1970	
	James Crandall	Chief Bureau of Evaluation and Instructional Research
COLORADO	- January 21, 1970	
	Edwin Hildebrand	Coordinator Four State Diffusion Project SPREAD
GEORGIA	- January 19, 1970	
	William Schabacher	Associate Director for Research and Assessment Division of Planning, Research and Evaluation
MARYLAND	- December 22, 1969	
	Richard McKay	Assistant State Superintendent Division of Planning, Research and Evaluation
MASSACHUSETTS	- January 5, 1970	
	James Baker	Assistant Commissioner for Research and Development
NEW JERSEY	- January 8, 1970	
	Stanley Salett	Assistant Commissioner Division of Research, Planning, Evaluation and Program Development

NEW YORK	- January 6, 1970	
	Lorne Woollatt	Associate Commissioner Office of Research and Evaluation
OREGON	- February 25, 1970	
	Milt Baum	Director of Research (formerly)
PENNSYLVANIA	- NO VISIT	
	Patrick Toole*	Consultant
	Robert Hayes (telephone interview)	Director of Bureau of Research
TEXAS	- January 20, 1970	
	Charles Nix	Associate Commissioner for Planning
UTAH	- February 25, 1970	
	Rowan Stutz	Head Division of Research and Innovation
WISCONSIN	- January 22, 1970	
	Herbert Klausmeier	Director Research and Development Center for Cognitive Studies University of Wisconsin
	Mike Wass de Czege	Assistant Planner Office of Superintendent

* Patrick Toole worked as consultant to IED during the study and and served as IED interviewer at all Site Visits.

APPENDIX D

PARTICIPANTS IN MEETINGS AT OE REGIONAL OFFICES

Region I
Boston, Massachusetts
June 29, 1970

Carl Bache - Wiig	Maine
James Baker	Massachusetts
Ernest Berty	West Virginia
H. Stuart Pickard	New Hampshire
Edward Wilcox	Rhode Island
Richard McCann	OE Regional Office

Region II
New York, New York
June 3, 1970

William Furman	New York
James League	Maryland
William Phillips	New Jersey
John Sokol	OE Regional Office

Region III
Charlottesville, Virginia
June 15, 1970

Charles Clear	Virginia
John Morrow	South Caroli

Region IV
Atlanta, Georgia
June 5, 1970

Edward Allen	Florida
Roy Jones	Tennessee
William Shabacker	Georgia
James Swanson	Florida
Theodore Abell	OE Regional Office

Region V
Chicago, Illinois
June 8, 1970

John Cook	Wisconsin
Earl Grove	Indiana
James Mendenhall	Illinois
Loren Nichol	Illinois
Betty Keith	OE Regional Office
Joseph Murnin	OE Regional Office

Region VI
Kansas City, Missouri
June 10, 1970

Francis Colgan	Nebraska
Harry Dean	Kansas
Glenn White	Missouri
W. Phillip Hefley	OE Regional Office

Region VII
Dallas, Texas
June 12, 1970

Paul Brown	Louisiana
Charles Nix	Texas
Harold Haswell	OE Regional Office

Region VIII
Denver, Colorado
June 15, 1970

Roger Hanson	Wyoming
S. Walter Harvey	Minnesota
Lowell Jensen	North Dakota
Marcia Meeker	New Mexico
Walter Turner	Colorado
Lewis Crum	OE Regional Office
Russell Vlaaderin	Educational Commission of the States

Region IX
San Francisco, California
June 17, 1970

James Crandall	California
Arthur Lee	Arizona
Kay Palmer	Nevada
Rowen Stutz	Utah
Walter Hirsch	OE Regional Office

Patrick Toole - IED Interviewer at all the Regional Meetings

APPENDIX E

RDDDE PERSONNEL IN STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION RESPONDING TO QUESTIONNAIRES 1969 - 1970

ALASKA
State Department of Education
Pouch F
Juneau, Alaska 99801

Anderson, Keith	Coordinator Office of Planning and Research
Carruthers, John	Asst. Coordinator, Planning and Research Office of the Commissioner
Kaden, Bonnie	Coordinator, Public Information and Publications Office of Public Information and Publications

ARKANSAS
State Department of Education
Arch Ford Education Building
Little Rock, Arkansas 72201

Knight, W. Grady	Administrator Program Planning and Evaluation Division of Vocational, Technical and Adult Education
Lever, Benjamin	Coordinator, Evaluation and Statistics Federal Educational Programs Division
Murphy, Sara	Coordinator, Dissemination and Follow Through Federal Educational Programs Division
Nichols, Jack	Research Associate Vocational Program Planning
Patrick, Peggy	Director of Program Analysis Program Planning, Evaluation and Exemplary Programs
Williams, B.	Associate Commissioner of Federal Programs Federal Educational Programs Division

CALIFORNIA
State Department of Education
721 Capitol Mall
Sacramento, California 95814

Church, John	Chief Bureau of References Services
Crandall, James	Chief Bureau of Evaluation and Research
Jensen, G.	Consultant Bureau of Evaluation and Research Division of Compensatory Education
Law, Alexander	Consultant, Evaluation and Research Division of Compensatory Education
McCormick, William	Research and Evaluation Consultant Bureau of Evaluation and Research Division of Compensatory Education
Madden, J.	Consultant Bureau of Evaluation and Research
Reeves, Hubert	Consultant Bureau of Evaluation and Research Division of Compensatory Education
Shellhammer, Thomas	Chief Division of Compensatory Education

COLORADO
State Department of Education
528 State Office Building
Denver, Colorado 80203

Anderson, Calvin	Executive Assistant to the Commissioner
Duncan, Roger	Consultant Research and Development Unit
Edsall, Richard	Supervisor, Evaluation State Board for Community College and Occupational Education

Hildebrand, Edwin	Project Director, Four-State Diffusion Project SPREAD Dissemination and Diffusion Unit, Office of Management Services
Jesser, David	Associate Director Improving State Leadership in Education
Ludlea, Arthur	Assistant Director Improving State Leadership in Education
Morphet, Edgar	Director Improving State Leadership in Education
Turner, Walter	Acting Director Research and Development

CONNECTICUT
State Department of Education
P.O. Box 2219
Hartford, Connecticut 06115

Bertagna, Charles	Consultant in Research Research and Planning Unit, Bureau of Vocational Services
Errede, Michael	Consultant Research Research and Planning Unit, Bureau of Vocational Services
Righthand, Herbert	Bureau Chief Division of Vocational Education
Wilson, Richard	Co-Director Research and Planning Unit, Bureau of Vocational Services

DELAWARE
Department of Public Instruction
P.O. Box 697
Dover, Delaware 19901

Campbell, James	Research Intern Research, Planning and Evaluation

English, Joseph	Supervisor, Occupational Research Auxiliary Services
Johnston, Paul	Supervisor, Research Research, Planning, and Evaluation
Jones, Anne	Statistician, Research, Planning, and Evaluation Auxiliary Services
McGowan, John	Supervisor, Occupational Research Auxiliary Services
Miller, Marian	Supervisor, Evaluation Research, Planning, and Evaluation
Mohrmann, Jeanne	Research Intern Research, Planning, and Evaluation
Orr, Charles	Supervisor, Evaluation Division of Research Planning, and Evaluation
Peyser, Harry	Research Systems Analyst Research, Planning, and Evaluation
Wise, Wilmer	Director, Research Research, Planning, and Evaluation

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
State Department of Education
415 Twelfth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004

Baugham, Robyn	Research Assistant Research Information Center Division of Planning, Innovation and Research
Bland, June	Research Assistant Division of Planning, Research and Evaluation
Bulow, Rose	Program Analyst Division of Planning, Innovation and Research

Cobb, Herman	Research and Evaluation Associate Division of Planning, Innovation and Research
Cooper, Mildred	Assistant Superintendent for Research and Evaluation Acting Division Head Division of Planning, Research and Evaluation
Fish, Roger	Coordinator Research Information Center, Division of Planning, Innovation and Research
Glenn, Beulah	Educational Research Assistant Division of Planning, Research and Evaluation
Harrington, Cynthia	Program Analyst Division of Planning, Innovation, and Research
Kinnear, Kathlyne	Research Assistant Division of Planning, Research and Evaluation
Kullberg, Warren	Research Assistant and Program Analyst Division of Planning, Research and Evaluation
Leader, Joyce	Program Analyst Division of Planning, Research and Evaluation
Ordonez, Josefina	Research Associate Division of Planning, Research and Evaluation
Taylor, George	Educational Research and Planning Associate Division of Planning, Innovation and Research

Vails, Lavolia	Educational Planning and Research Associate Division of Planning, Research and Evaluation
White, Thomas	Research and Planning Associate Division of Planning, Research and Evaluation

FLORIDA
State Department of Education
258 Knott Building
Tallahassee, Florida 32304

Adams, Albert	Bureau Chief Bureau of Teacher Education, Certification and Accreditation
Bert, Clara	Consultant Vocational Research and Evaluation Function Division of Vocational Technical and Adult Education
Chick, Charles	Chief Bureau of School Facilities
Crenshaw, Joseph	Chief Bureau of Curriculum and Instruction Division of Elementary and Secondary Education
Eaddy, Kenneth	Administrator Vocational Research and Evaluation Function Division of Vocational Technical and Adult Education
Giehls, Jr. Roy	Consultant Vocational Research and Evaluation Function Division of Vocational Technical and Adult Education
Hancock, Robert	Consultant Vocational Research and Evaluation Function Division Vocational Technical and Adult Education

Kurth, Richard	Educational Consultant Bureau of Research Division of Elementary and Secondary Education
Moore, James	Associate, Program Development Bureau of Curriculum and Instruction
Swanson, James	Assistant Chief Bureau of Research
Wade, I. M.	Chief Bureau of Research

GEORGIA
State Department of Education
State Office Building
Atlanta, Georgia 30334

Athon, Troy	Coordinator, Standards and Medical Services Division of Program Planning and Development
Avery, Eileen	Utilization Specialist Educational Television Services
Brown, Barbara	Utilization Specialist Educational Television Services
Clark, Russell	Director Division of Planning, Research and Evaluation
Collins, Louis	Chief Coordinator, Correctional Rehabilitation Services Division of Program Planning and Development
Cosper, Olan	Utilization Specialist Educational Television Services
Edge, Jesse	Information Officer I Publications and Information Services

Harkins, Michael	Utilization Specialist Educational Television Services
Harkins, Rebecca	Statistician I Planning, Research, and Evaluation
Hawkins, Robert	Development Specialist Educational Television Services
Hopkins, Marjorie	Information Officer II Publications and Information Services
House, Sarah	Statistician II Planning, Research and Evaluation
Jones, Bobbie	Utilization Specialist Educational Television Services
Jones, Liz	Artist Staff Services
Kennedy, John	Educational Program Consultant Division of Planning, Research and Evaluation
Knott, Charles	Research Associate I Planning, Research and Evaluation
Lindsey Jr., Jarrot	Director Publications and Information Branch
Luckie, William	Associate Director for Planning Division of Planning, Research, and Evaluation
McCollum, Tommy	Coordinator Services for Blind Vocational Rehabilitation Program Planning and Development
Mitchell, Sam	Chief Coordinator, Staff Development and Training Program Planning and Development
Mullins, James	Supervisor of Field Services Educational Television Services
Newbill, Sallie	Statistician II Planning, Research and Evaluation

Ottinger, Richard	Executive Director Educational Television Services
Pardue, V.	Information Officer III Publications and Information Services
Peabody, Myra	Information Officer I Publications and Information Services
Pearce, Clyde	Educational Program Executive Administrative Leadership Services Division
Peneguy, Louis	Public Information Unit Chief Publications and Information Services
Raymond, Anne	Chief, Publications and Materials Publications and Information Services,
Reynolds, Kenneth	Supervisor-Work Study and Special Needs Programs Leadership Services
Schabacker, William	Associate Director for Research and Assessment Division of Planning, Research and Evaluation
Scott, Marion	State Supervisor of Program Evaluation Leadership Services Unit Vocational Education
Sharpe, Betty	Utilization Specialist Educational Television Services
Van Orden, Howard	Media Specialist Publications and Information Services
Walker, Larry	Program Coordinator Mental Health Rehabilitation Division of Program Planning and Development
Wallace, Marvin	Research Associate I Division of Planning, Research and Evaluation

William, Earl	Coordinator, Curriculum Materials Development Vocational Education
Williams, Raymond	Utilization Specialist Educational Television Services
Wilson, O.	Director of ITV Educational Television Services
Wright, Yvonne	Television Teacher (Spanish) Educational Television Services
Young, Leonard	Coordinator, Mental Retarded and School Rehabilitation Services Division Program Planning and Development

HAWAII
State Department of Education
1625 Wist Place
Honolulu, Hawaii 96822

Keating, Barbara	Dissemination Specialist Hawaii English Project
Koki, Stanley	Section Head, Literature Hawaii English Project
Maney, Florence	Chief Planner, Literature Hawaii English Project
Nunes, Shiho	Administrator Hawaii English Project
Port, Richard	Curriculum Planner, Coordinator Language Skills Hawaii English Project
Rodgers, Theodore	Chief Planner, Language Systems Hawaii English Project

Schimabukuro, Shinkichi	Director, Curriculum Development and Technology Office of Instructional Services
Yucker, Jr. Julius	Hawaii English Program

IDAHO
State Department of Education
State House
Boise, Idaho 83707

Engelking, D.	State Superintendent of Public Instruction

ILLINOIS
State Department of Education
325 South Fifth Street
Springfield, Illinois 62704

Fitzgerald, Ellen	Supervisor, ERIC Program Department of Educational Research, Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction
Mencenhall, James	Director of Educational Research Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction
Nicol, Loren	Assistant Director Educational Research Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction
Olson, Thomas	Assistant Director Title III ESEA Title III ESEA Department and Division of Pupil Services
Ranway, James	Assistant Director Department of Educational Research
Wasem, G.	Assistant Director Department of Educational Research

IOWA
State Department of Education
Department of Public Instruction
Grimes State Office Building
Des Moines, Iowa 50319

Smith, Richard	Deputy State Superintendent of Public Instruction

KENTUCKY
State Department of Education
152 Taylor Education Building
Lexington, Kentucky 40506

Davidson, Estill	Research Assistant Division of Research
Ellison, Martha	Coordinator Office of Curriculum Development
Elswick, Donald	Director Division of Research
Espinoza, Arsenio	Research Associate Research Coordinating Unit University of Kentucky
Gyuro, Steven	Assistant Professor Research Coordinating Unit University of Kentucky
Mannebach, Alfred	Assistant Professor Research Coordinating Unit University of Kentucky
McKinney, Floyd	Assistant Professor Research Coordinating Unit University of Kentucky
Omvig, Clayton	Research Coordinating Unit University of Kentucky

LOUISIANA
State Department of Education
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70804

Edwards, Normand	Director, School Administrator Data Processing and School Research

MAINE
State Department of Education
Augusta, Maine 04330

Bache-Wiig, Carl	Director, Bureau of Research School Administrative Services

/terf, Charles	Coordinator, Regional Technical-Vocational Centers
Butler, Carl	Consultant Bureau of Vocational Education
Devitt, Joseph	Director Bureau of Secondary Education
Jones, Jean	Supervisor Home Economics Education
McCullough, David	Consultant Bureau of Vocational Education
Moody, Marian	Consultant Home Economics Education
Norton, Omar	Director Bureau of Elementary Education
Padham, Elwood	Director, Vocational Education Bureau of Vocational Education
Trenholm, Beverly	Director Bureau of Guidance, Special and Education

MARYLAND
State Department of Education
State Office Building
301 W Preston Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21201

Delaney, J.	Assistant State Superintendent Division of Vocational Rehabilitation
Kip, Marinus	Educational Coordinator Research Coordinating Unit
League, James	Consultant in Research Research Section Division of Planning, Research, and Evaluation
McKay, Richard	Assistant State Superintendent Division of Planning, Research, and Evaluation
Myers, Merl	Assistant Director, Research, Planning and Program Development Division of Vocational Rehabilitation

Rohen, Terrence	Consultant in Research Division of Planning, Research and Evaluation
Shami, Mohammad	Consultant in Research, Instruction Research Section, Division of Planning, Research, and Evaluation
Spurrier, Elizabeth	Staff Specialist in Evaluation Division of Planning, Research, and Evaluation
Stagmer, Robert	Data Processing Systems Analyst IV Automatic Data Processing Section Division of Planning, Research, and Evaluation

MASSACHUSETTS
State Department of Education
182 Tremont Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02111

Baher, James	Assistant Commissioner Division of Research and Development
Baker, James	Assistant Commissioner Division of Research and Development
Green, Mary	Sr. Supervisor, Research Coordinating Unit Division of Occupational Education
Powell, Marjorie	Supervisor in Education Division of Research and Development
MacAdam, Phyllis	Sr. Supervisor in Education, ESEA Title III Bureau of Curriculum Innovation
Minkle, James	ESEA Title III Project Director Bureau of Curriculum Innovation
Myers, Glenn	Systems Analyst Bureau of Research and Development
Torres, Donald	Senior Supervisor in Education Bureau of Curriculum Innovation

Watson, Robert	Director Bureau of Curriculum Innovation

MICHIGAN
State Department of Education
P.O. Box 420
Lansing, Michigan 48902

Ahola, Allen	Educational Research Consultant Bureau of Research, Education and Assessment
Bebermeyer, James	Consultant, Research Coordinating Unit Bureau of Research
Beere, Carole	Research Consultant Evaluation Services
Chung, Ki-Suck	Educational Research Consultant Bureau of Research, Evaluation and Assessment.
Coleman, Geraldine	Educational Consultant Bureau of Research, Evaluation and Assessment
Hankins, Philip	Evaluation Research Consultant Bureau of Assessment, Evaluation and Research Services
Heyser, Nancy	Administrative Analyst Bureau of Research, Information Services
Huyser, Robert	Coordinator, Education Assessment Services Bureau of Research, Evaluation and Assessment
Jones, James	Research Consultant Research
Lasell, Warren	Educational Research Consultant Research Coordinating Unit
McGoveny, Marsha	Administrative Analyst Bureau of Research, Evaluation and Assessment
Robertson, John	Consultant Research Bureau

Rumbaugh, Stanley	Educational Research Consultant Bureau of Research, Evaluation and Assessment
Snepp, Neil	Consultant Vocational Education Evaluation Bureau of Research
Voelkner, Alvin	Educational Research Consultant Bureau of Research
Wilbur, Thomas	Acting Deputy Associate Superintendent Bureau of Research, Evaluation and Assessment

MINNESOTA
State Department of Education
456 Centennial Building
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101

Anderson, Gayle	Planning Consultant Division of Planning and Development
Burland, Ronald	Assistant Director Professions Development Section
Chorn, E.	Supervisor, Information Services Division of Vocational Rehabilitation
Gehrke, August	Assistant Commissioner for Rehabilitation and Special Education Division of Vocational Rehabilitation
Goralski, Patricia	Director, Professions Development Section Division of Instruction
Harvey, Samuel	Director Research, State Aids, and Statistics Section
Hellekson, Joan	Consultant Vocational Program Planning and Development
Holmes, Archie	Director Equal Educational Opportunities Section
Kairies, Eugene	Program Consultant Division of Planning and Development
Keenan, William	Administrator Minnesota National Laboratory

Kodet, Leonard	Consultant Vocational Planning and Program Development
Malinski, Joseph	Director, Planning and Development Section Vocational-Technical Education
Nachman, Leonard	Evaluation Consultant Division of Planning and Development
Peterson, E.	Assistant Commissioner of Education Division of Instruction
Preston, Jane	Consultant Vocational Program Planning and Development
Sermon, Duane	Rehabilitation Specialist for Research Staff Services Section
Taylor, Carol	Administrative Analyst Division of Vocational Rehabilitation, Staff Services
Weddick, Gregory	Assistant Commissioner Division of Planning and Development
Woods, Sandra	Research Consultant Equal Educational Opportunities Section

MISSISSIPPI
State Department of Education
Jackson, Mississippi 39205

Thompson, Ruby	Supervisor, Finance and Statistics Finance and Research
Wall, James	Co-Director Vocational-Technical Education Mississippi State University

MISSOURI
State Department of Education
Jefferson City, Missouri 65101

Allan, John	Director Planning and Evaluation Section
Foster, Charles	Director, Guidance Services Vocational Division

Taylor, Robert	Director Health, Physical Education and Safety
White, W.	Director Research Coordinating Unit

NEBRASKA
State Department of Education
Lincoln, Nebraska

Colgan, Francis	Coordinator; Planning, Research, Evaluation Division of Instruction

NEVADA
State Department of Education
Heroes Memorial Bldg.
Carson City, Nevada 89701

Bunten, John	Director Vocational-Technical Education Branch
Kiley, James	Director Federal Relations and Programs Branch
Palmer, Kay	Chief, Educational Research Federal Relations and Programs Branch

NEW HAMPSHIRE
State Department of Education
64 North Main Street
Concord, New Hampshire 03301

Bankor, Richard	Director Research Coordinating Unit
Batten, Robert	Chief Division of Vocational Rehabilitation
Clark, Peter	Consultant, Vocational Rehabilitation, Planning and Development Division of Vocational Rehabilitation
Hodges, Jr., Richard	Consultant, Title I ESEA Division of Instruction
Pickard, H.	Director Planning, Development and Evaluation

Randall, Donald	Director of Research and Testing Division of Instruction
Wing, R.	Director New Hampshire ESEA Title III State

NEW JERSEY
State Department of Education
225 West State Street
Trenton, New Jersey 08625

Andrews, Robert	Center Administrative Consultant Micro-Social Learning Center
Casey, John	Assistant Director, Office of Research Division of Research, Planning and Evaluation
Girandola, Rudolph	Director, Program Development Bureau of Occupational Research Development
Kelly, Joseph	Director, Vocational Curriculum and Media Research Bureau of Occupational Research Development
Koo, Poyen	Director, Vocational Data Collection and Evaluation Bureau of Vocational Research Development
Lewis, Ronald	Director, Program Management Division Research, Planning and Evaluation Office of Program Development
Lucow, William	Director, Office of Management Information System Division of Research, Planning and Evaluation
McSweeney, Joseph	Director Division Research, Newark Learning Development Center
Margules, Morton	Associate State Director of Vocational-Technical Education Bureau of Occupational Research Development
Ogden, Evelyn	Assistant Director, Office of Program Management Research, Planning and Evaluation

Phillips, Jr., William	Director, Office of Research Division of Research, Planning, Evaluation and Program Development
Pinkowski, Francis	Director, Office of Management Information Division of Research, Planning and Evaluation
Rosser, John	Executive Director Educational Improvement Center
Salett, Stanley	Assistant Commissioner Division of Research, Planning, Evaluation and Program Development
Seltzer, Harold	Director, Pilot Demonstration and Exemplary Programs Bureau of Occupational Research Development
Swanson, Carl	Director, Plans and Supplementary Centers Division of Research, Planning and Evaluation
Ward, Robert	Director, Program Development and Division of Research, Planning and Evaluation
York, Edwin	Coordinator, Occupational Research Development Resource Center, Division of Vocational Education

NEW MEXICO
State Department of Education
State Capitol
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501

Barck, Phillip	Director, Research and Development
Mayhon, W.	Director, ESEA Title III

NEW YORK
State Department of Education
194 Washington Avenue
Albany, New York 12210

Benson, Gregory	Assistant in Research Research Coordinating Unit
Bentley, Fred	Associate Bureau of Educational Finance Research
Berkun, Howard	Associate in Education Research/Coordinator of Experimental Programs

Bowman, Fred	Consultant Center for Planning
Burke, William	Senior Research Analyst Bureau of Educational Finance Research
Burton, Richard	Educational Aide Bureau of Urban and Community Programs Evaluation
Calvin, Thomas	Bureau Chief Bureau of Educational Finance Research
Campbell, Colin	Education Aide Bureau of Occupational Education Research
Connell, Richard	Education Aide Trainee Bureau of Urban and Community Programs Evaluation
Dickson, G.	Associate in Education Research Bureau of Occupational Education Research
DiLorenzo, Louis	Director Research Training Program
Doellefeld, James	Assistant in Education Research
Dormanoy, William	Associate Bureau of Educational Finance Research
Finkelstein, Elsie	Associate in Education Research Bureau of Urban and Community Programs Evaluation
Firman, William	Assistant Commissioner for Research and Evaluation Office of Research, Evaluation and Information Center
Irvine, David	Chief Bureau of School Programs Evaluation
Jaffarian, William	Associate in Education Research Bureau of Urban and Community Programs Evaluation
Kelly, Eileen	Associate in Education Research Bureau of Urban and Community Programs Evaluation

Klevan, Albert	Chief Bureau of Department Programs Evaluation
Lee, Sang-Joo	Research Intern Bureau of Research in Higher and Professional Education
McLean, John	Education Aide Bureau of Department Programs Evaluation
Mack, Theresa	Research Associate Bureau of Department Programs Evaluation
Miller, Kathryn	Education Aide Bureau of School and Cultural Research
Miller, Robert	Associate in Education Research Bureau of Urban and Community Programs Evaluation
Nutter, Donald	Research Associate Bureau of Research in Higher Education
O'Reilly, Robert	Chief Bureau of School and Cultural Research
Patti, Esther	Assistant in Education Research Bureau of School and Cultural Research
Perisco, Sylvia	Education Aide Bureau of Research in Higher and Professional Education
Pillsworth, Philip	Education Aide Bureau of School Programs Evaluation
Reiner, Diane	Education Aide Bureau of Occupational Education Research
Robertson, Alan	Director Division of Education Evaluation
Salter, Ruth	Associate in Education Research Bureau of School and Cultural Research
Scurrah, Mark	Assistant Director Center for Planning and Innovation

Simmons, Oscar	Consultant in Educational Planning Center for Planning and Innovation
Smith, A.	Assistant in Education Research Bureau of Department Programs Evaluation
Spath, Guy	Assistant in Education Research Bureau of School and Cultural Research
Stewart, Alan	Research Associate Bureau of School Programs Evaluation
Stehr, Linda	Education Aide Center for Planning and Innovation
Tebordo, Iona	Assistant in Education Research Bureau of Department Programs Evaluation
Thomson, D.	Assistant in Education Research Bureau of Research in Higher and Professional Education
vanGendt, Gerlach	Assistant in Education Research Bureau of School and Cultural Research
Wedekind, Carl	Director of Education Research Division of Research
Wilkes, Whitney	Education Aide Bureau of Occupational Education Research
Wohlferd, Gerald	Associate in Education Research Bureau of School Programs Evaluation
Wolfe, Helen	Acting Chief Bureau of Research in Higher and Professional Education
Wollatt, Lorne	Associate Commissioner For Research and Evaluation Office of Research, Evaluation and the Information Center for Education
Yates, Jack	Education Aide Bureau of School and Cultural Research

NORTH CAROLINA
State Department of Education
305½ West Martin Street
Raleigh, North Carolina 27602

Brown, William	Director of Research Division of Research
Clemmons, Jesse	Assistant Director Occupational Research Unit
Crowder, Shirley	Social Research Assistant II Division of Vocational Rehabilitation
Earp, Howard	State Coordinator Division of Vocational Rehabilitation
Evans, Robert	Project Director Model Research Dissemination System Project Division of Research
Gibson, Robert	State Coordinator, Mental Health Services Vocational Rehabilitation Central Offices
Jones, Jon	Research Associate Occupational Research Unit
Manley, Fred	Assistant Director Occupational Research Unit
Moore, Dan	Director Occupational Research Unit
Morrow, Joseph	Assistant State Director Division of Vocational Rehabilitation Research and Training Section
Mulholland, Vester	Special Consultant Planning, Research and Development
O'Connell, John	Research Consultant Division of Research
Oliver, William	State Coordinator Division of Vocational Rehabilitation

NORTH DAKOTA
State Department of Education
Capitol Building
Bismarck, North Dakota 58501

Jensen, Lowell	Department of Public Instruction
Keuhn, Lloyd	Information Director Department of Public Instruction
Lacher, S.	Critical Subjects Consultant Department of Public Instruction

OHIO
State Department of Education
781 Northwest Boulevard
Columbus, Ohio 43212

Covault, Thomas	Educational Consultant Division of Research, Planning and Development
Crawford, William	Educational Consultant Division of Special Education
Dragin, Richard	Chief, Planning Section Division of Research, Planning and Development
Dyck, Donald	Evaluation and Planning Consultant Division of Research, Planning and Development
Fisher, Thomas	Educational Consultant Division of Special Education
Knight, Russell	Consultant , Dissemination Division of Research, Planning and Development ESEA, Title III Section
Scott, Franklin	Educational Consultant Division of Research, Planning and Development
Sowers, Donald	Educational Consultant Division of Research, Planning and Development
Todd, Joseph	Assistant Director Division of Special Education
Vild, Louis	Educational Consultant III Division of Research, Planning and Development

Working, Russell	Director Division of Research, Planning and Development
Yost, Marlen	Chief, Evaluation and Planning Division of Research, Planning and Development

OREGON
State Department of Education
942 Lancaster Drive
Salem, Oregon 97310

Baum, Milt	Director of Personnel and Community Relations Management Services
Bear, Willard	Director of Federal Programs Federal Programs
Clemmer, Robert	Evaluation Specialist Federal Programs
Grosshickle, Jack	Evaluation Specialist Federal Programs
Miller, Don	Dissemination Specialist Title III Programs
Osborn, Vernon	Associate Superintendent Management Services and Program Support
Weider, Brayton	Coordinator of Information and Publications Personnel and Community Relations

PENNSYLVANIA
State Department of Education
Box 911
Harrisburgh, Pennsylvania 17126

Bauer, David	Research Associate I
Berger, Emanuel	Educational Research Associate Bureau of Research
Bruno, Nancy	Research Trainee Bureau of Research Division of Cooperative Research

Cober, John	Educational Research Associate Bureau of Research Division of Applied Research
Coldiron, J.	Educational Research Associate Bureau of Educational Quality Assessment
Curtis, Carroll	Educational Research Associate II Research Coordinating Unit for Vocational Education Bureau of Research
DiJohnson, Albert	Research Associate Bureau of Research
Donaldson, William	Educational Research Associate II Bureau of Educational Quality Assessment
Donny, William	Research Assistant
Durkee, Frank	Research Assistant II and Director of Applied Research Bureau of Research
Dusewicz, Russell	Research Associate and Project Dir., E.C.I.P. Bureau of Research
Franchak, Stephen	Research Assistant Research Coordinating Unit For Vocational Education
Geisinger, Robert	Research Associate Bureau of Research
Hayes, Robert	Director of Research Bureau of Research
Hertzog, James	Assessment Specialist Bureau of Educational Quality Assessment
Kendig, Thomas	Acting Director Bureau of Educational Quality Assessment
Keyes, Erma	Educational Research Associate I Bureau of Research
Landis, H.	Research Intern Bureau of Research

Laverty, Grace	Director Division of Cooperative Research Studies
Leonard, William	Education Research Assistant Division of Applied Research Bureau of Research
Lydon, Mary	Educational Research Assistant Bureau of Research
McGuiness, Thomas	Research Trainee Bureau of Research, Division of Cooperative Studies
Martinko, Agnes	Research Assistant Educational Research
Moody, Terman	Research Associate II Bureau of Vocational-Technical and Community Education
Rath, Joseph	Research Associate Bureau of Research
Reardon, Frank	Educational Research Assistant Bureau of Research
Rookey, Thomas	Research Assistant Division of Cooperative Studies Bureau of Research
Sites, Patricia	Educational Research Associate I Research Coordinating Unit for Vocational Education
Smink, Jay	Educational Research Associate Division of Vocational Research Bureau of Research.
Stank, Peggy	Educational Research Associate I Division of Cooperative Studies Bureau of Educational Research
Yan , Martin	Director Division of Research Design
Zawanski, Alfonso	Research Intern Division of Applied Research

RHODE ISLAND
State Department of Education
Roger Williams Building
Hayes Street
Providence, Rhode Island 02908

Cerjanec, Ruth	Consultant, School Media Centers and Title II ESEA Instructional Services
Costa, Edward	Coordinator, Compensatory Education
Essex, Stewart	Coordinator, School Plant Planning
Miles, James	Vocational Research Consultant State Agency for Elementary and Secondary Education Vocational Division
Ricci, Robert	Consultant, Evaluation and Dissemination Title III ESEA Instructional Services
Trombi, John	Consultant, Secondary Education Instructional Services
Wilcox, Edward	Associate Director State Agency for Elementary and Secondary Education Division of Research

SOUTH CAROLINA
State Department of Education
1202 Rutledge Building
Columbia, South Carolina 29201

Bruse, Thomas	Chief Supervisor of Surveys Office of Research and Planning
Bush, James	Statistician Office of Research and Planning
Corder, W.	Chief Supervisor Program for Exceptional Children
Craig, Virginia	Elementary Guidance Consultant Office of General Education Elementary Section

Crowley, Bruce	Director Office of General Education
Dorsey, Albert	Chief Supervisor Curriculum Development Section
Edwards, Charles	Supervisor of Evaluation Office of Research and Planning
Ellis, William	Director Office of Research
Folger, Mary	Information Analyst Research Information Unit Office of Research
Gordon, Kay	Consultant Program for Exceptional Children
Graham, James	Supervisor of Surveys Office of Research and Planning
Hartin, Theo	Early Childhood Education Supervisor Office of General Education Elementary Section
Henikoff, Jorja	Statistical Clerk Office of Research
Holcombe, David	Consultant Program for Exceptional Children
McMillan, Pamela	Statistician Office of Research
O'Connell, Maureeen	Coordinator, School Food Service
Pollack, Alan	Chief Supervisor, Research and Evaluation Office of Research and Planning
Stanton, Eva	Early Childhood Education Supervisor Office of General Education Elementary Section
Stuart, Jr., Hardwick	Research Assistant on Legal Affairs Office of Research
Trull, Joseph	Supervisor of Evaluation Division of Administration

SOUTH DAKOTA
State Department of Education
Pierre, South Dakota 57501

Quincey, William	Director, Planning and Evaluation

TEXAS
State Department of Education
201 East 11th Street
Capitol Station
Austin, Texas 78711

Barber, James	Director Occupational Research Coordinating Unit
Barnes, William	Research Assistant Occupational Research Coordinating Unit
Davidson, Dorothy	Director Program Development Division
Millican, Oscar	Assistant Director Occupational Research Coordinating Unit
Nicholas, Robert	Consultant Occupational Research Coordinating Unit
Nix, Charles	Associate Commissioner for Learning

UTAH
State Department of Education
400 University Club Building
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111

Cowan, Bill	Education Specialist Division of Research and Innovation
Gaddis, Glen	Research Associate Research Coordinating Unit Division of Research and Innovation
Lindsay, Kenneth	Coordinator, ESEA Title III Division of Research and Innovation
Merrell, Russell	Director Western States Small School Project for Utah Division of Research and Innovation

Stephens, John	Director Utah Research Coordinating Unit Utah State Board For Vocational Education
Stutz, Rowan	Administrator Division of Research and Innovation
Worthington, Kent	Director of Research Design and Evaluation Division of Research and Innovation

VIRGINIA
State Department of Education
1103 E. Main Street
Richmond, Virginia 23216

Boepple, Philip	Supervisor of Special Studies Division of Educational Research and Statistics
Clear, Charles	Director Division of Educational Research and Statistics
Fonda, Emma	Assistant Supervisor of Research Division of Educational Research and Statistics
Lewis, Jr., Roy	Systems Analyst Division of Research
Link, Daniel	Assistant Supervisor of Research Division of Educational Research and Statistics
Roberts, Joseph	Supervisor of Research Division of Educational Research and Statistics

WASHINGTON
State Department of Education
P.O. Box 527
Olympia, Washington 98501

Boyd, Richard	Director ESEA Title III & URRD
Capp, Marian	Project Evaluator Curriculum and Instruction

Carlstrom, Gerard	Evaluator, Federal Programs Research Office of Staff Services Division
Eisentrout, George	Assistant Supervisor Division of Administration and Finance
Farris, E.	Information Coordinator Federal Programs Division of Staff Services
Johnson, Harry	Research Associate Research Office
Metcalf, Alan	Research Director Research Office
Mould, Richard	Educational Program Specialist Superintendent of Public Instruction
Pilant, George	Director Research Coordinating Unit
Sayre, Margery	Information Specialist Research Office

WEST VIRGINIA
State Department of Education
Charleston, West Virginia 25305

Berty, Ernest	Director, Office of Research
Ebenle, Fred	Assistant State Superintendent and State Director of Vocational Education Bureau of Vocational, Technical and Adult Educational
Smith, Glenn	Director, Research Coordinating Unit Marshall University

WISCONSIN
State Department of Education
126 Langdon Street
Madison, Wisconsin 53702

Buchmiller, Archie	Deputy State Superintendent Office of the State Superintendent

Cook, John	Coordinator, Research Design and Administration Division for Handicapped Children
Dimick, Donald	Coordinator of Federal Progrms Administrative Services
Fitzgerald, Penny	Project Associate Division for Handicapped Children
Fosdick, James	Research Analyst Division of State Aids and School Finance
Gottman, John	Research Design Specialist Evaluation Center
Haubrich, Paul	Project Coordinator Division for Handicapped Children
Howard, E.	Educational Planner Bureau for Planning, Research and Evaluation
Way, Russell	Program Administrator Title III, ESEA

WYOMING
State Department of Education
Capitol Building
Cheyenne, Wyoming 82001

Black, Fred	Assistant Director - Research Consultant Research Coordinating Unit
Goff, Maurice	Research Assistant, Research Coordinating Unit Occupational Education Services
Jeanroy, Donald	Research Assistant, Research Coordinating Unit Occupational Education Services
Nightwine, Bill	Director, Research Coordinating Unit Occupational Education Services
Perryman, Bruce	Administrative Assistant to Chief Research Coordinating Unit Occupational Education Services
Smith, June	Research Information Specialist Research Coordinating Unit Occupational Education

APPENDIX F

TABLES

Table 1

RESPONSE TO "SURVEY OF STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT DEMONSTRATION DISSEMINATION AND EVALUATION (RDDDE)" 1969-1970

	Number of Units	Number of States
Returned survey with information	98	38
No units performing RDDDE as defined[a]		12
Did not respond		2
Total state departments surveyed		52[b]

a. Three said they were in the process of organizing RDDDE units at the time of the survey.

b. The 50 states plus Washington D.C. and Puerto Rico.

Table 2

UNITS IN STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION
PERFORMING RDDDE ACTIVITIES
1969-1970

Number of Units Within One SDE Performing RDDDE Activities	Number of SDEs Reporting that number RDDDE Units		
One RDDDE Unit	16	Single Units	16 States
Two RDDDE Units	13		
Three RDDDE Units	2		
Four RDDDE Units	2		
Five RDDDE Units	3		
Seven RDDDE Units	1		
Twenty RDDDE Units	1	Multiple Units	22 States
Total states reporting	38		38

Table 3

RDDDE UNITS IN STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION REPORTING ACTIVITY IN OTHER ADMINISTRATIVE UNITS IN EACH CATEGORY OF RDDDE 1969-1970

Activity	Number	Percent[a]
Research	44	45
Development	65	66
Demonstration	55	56
Dissemination	65	66
Evaluation	68	69

[a]Based on a total of 98 units.

Table 4

RESPONSES BY RDDDE UNIT HEADS IN
STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION TO STATEMENTS
REGARDING RDDDE UNITS ACTIVITIES
1969-1970

Unit heads were asked to enter on the left, the answer which best describes their informed knowledge of the situation in the state department of education and on the right, the answer which best describes their opinion of what the situation should be. (98 unit heads responded.)

A. Knowledge

(1) Usually (2/3 or more of the time)
(2) Some of the time (1/3 to 2/3)
(3) Seldom (1/3 or less)
(4) Do not know

B. Opinion

(1) Should usually be true
(2) Should sometimes be true
(3) Should seldom be true
(4) No opinion

Percent of Responses: Knowledge					ITEM	Percent of Responses: Opinion				
1	2	3	4	Total		1	2	3	4	Total
30	34	35	0	99	1. Large arrays of routinely collected data are machine processed, electronically or mechanically stored and can be rapidly retrieved.	81	15	4	0	100
40	35	23	1	99	2. Data routinely gathered are available for special studies, analyses or reports extending beyond those regularly undertaken.	87	13	0	0	100
23	42	31	4	100	3. Where data routinely collected on a state-wide basis are inadequate for special-purpose studies, special data collections are easily authorized and undertaken.	69	24	5	1	99
48	34	14	4	100	4. There are budgetary provisions for data gathering, processing, manipulation and analysis.	96	4	0	0	100
25	34	39	3	101	5. Where data or study demands are too extensive for regular departmental staff, contracts for outside services are used.	60	37	1	1	99
18	35	46	1	100	6. Research or studies with long-range or complex decision-making implications are contracted out to consulting firms, universities, R and D centers, etc.	26	52	17	4	99

Knowledge					ITEM	Opinion				
1	2	3	4	Total		1	2	3	4	Total
40	24	32	4	100	7. Decision-oriented research or activities (arising in response to an immediate pressing problem or having manifest practicality) predominate in the department.	40	40	18	1	99
59	20	14	6	99	8. Short-range decision studies or information needs predominate and take precedence over long-range decision studies.	11	46	42	1	100
20	30	44	6	100	9. The department prefers to cultivate or to use outside research capabilities rather than to develop them internally.	14	42	37	6	99
31	29	36	4	100	10. The department is a transmitter of research first, a user second and a producer last.	23	32	35	9	99
77	6	14	3	100	11. Research or studies with long-range or complex decision making implications are more likely to be funded with federal than with state funds.	21	57	19	4	101
31	36	31	1	99	12. There is interest in and support for educational research.	91	8	1	0	100
64	12	6	18	100	13. During fiscal retrenchments, research activity is cut back before operational programs are.	11	42	45	1	99
51	25	23	1	100	14. Research and planning are treated as related entities.	89	8	3	0	101
32	33	34	1	100	15. Research provides input for departmental planning.	79	17	3	1	100
28	34	26	12	100	16. Research conducted within the department is held in as high esteem as that undertaken outside the department.	79	17	3	1	100
70	11	12	7	100	17. Field requests are for planning and development help first, research last.	17	46	30	6	99

Knowledge					ITEM	Opinion				
1	2	3	4	Total		1	2	3	4	Total
37	35	23	5	100	18. Planning and development needs determine research activities.	48	41	6	4	99
44	27	19	9	99	19. Evaluation and assessment are considered more important than research.	12	51	25	11	99
63	17	15	5	100	20. Requests from the field for evaluation and assessment are more common than those for research.	17	55	19	9	100
63	12	13	12	100	21. Requests from the governor's office or the legislature are for evaluation and assessment rather than for research.	20	57	14	8	99
69	8	6	17	100	22. The governor's and legislature's interest in planning is greater than their interest in research.	18	48	22	12	100
18	18	33	30	99	23. The governor's office or his administrative agents are imposing their information requirements or information generating procedures on research activity.	0	25	53	22	100
26	16	22	36	100	24. One result of the imposition is that departmental program activity is influenced by non-program considerations; for example, quantifiability of need.	0	15	54	31	100
44	19	13	23	99	25. Some program activities that do not readily lend themselves to the governor's or legislature's information requirements suffer from budgetary neglect - research needs, for example, as compared to student transportation needs.	13	19	44	23	99
25	16	39	20	100	26. A management plan determines RDDDE placement throughout the department.	65	12	8	14	99
28	28	22	22	100	27. Planning units have greater access to the departmental hierarchy than do RDDDE units.	14	27	42	17	100

Knowledge					ITEM	Opinion				
1	2	3	4	Total		1	2	3	4	Total
28	27	27	19	101	28. Planners are becoming (or are now) an intervening layer between RDDDE practitioners and departmental policy-makers.	16	29	37	18	100
37	29	17	17	100	29. Many planning, coordinating and managing procedures are being used or implemented within the department without adequate evaluation or testing.	5	13	74	8	100
24	32	35	9	100	30. Research staff are moving into planing roles within the department.	42	27	23	7	99
8	11	59	22	100	31. Educational organizations--such as teachers' associations and federations, school board associations, PTA groups, etc. - give a high priority to research and development.	45	43	3	9	100
20	26	31	23	100	32. Management studies of departmental operations propose (or have done) much to alter the department's research and development structure.	48	29	2	21	100
37	33	18	13	101	33. Consolidated reports and information needs--on both state and federal levels--are altering or have potential to alter departmental RDDDE structure.	36	41	13	9	99
16	30	52	1	99	34. Skilled RDDDE staff are readily available.	72	14	9	4	99
14	35	37	13	99	35. Departmental or school-district-recruited employees are being "retooled" for RDDDE responsibilities.	36	44	10	10	100
6	28	49	17	100	36. Professional field agents are employed by the department to carry out RDDDE program activities in the field.	27	53	7	13	100
18	43	32	7	100	37. Professional agents affiliated with other agencies, e.g. college and universities, and not in the departmental employ, are available and used to carry out departmental RDDDE activities in the field.	25	64	7	4	100

Table 5

PLACEMENT OF RDDDE UNITS WITHIN
THE ADMINISTRATION OF STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION
1969-1970

Number of Layers Between RDDDE Units and the Chief State School Officer	Number of Units
Report directly to CSSO	24
One intervening layer	41
Two intervening layers	26
Three intervening layers	3
Five or more intervening layers	2
No response to this question	2
Total units responding	98

Table 6

METHODS OF COORDINATING RDDDE ACTIVITIES WITHIN STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION 1969-1970

Method of Coordination	Percent of Units Indicating Use of Each Method[a]
By department chief's cabinet	34
By department coordinating committee	18
By specific and non-overlapping assignments	13
By unit heads, informally	42
Other[b]	6
Little or no coordination exists	15

a. Multiple responses from a total of 98 units.

b. Inter-unit group such as a task force or office memos and publications.

Table 7

METHODS OF COORDINATING RDDDE ACTIVITIES WITHIN
STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION
1969-1970

Method of Coordination	Percent[a]				
	R	D	D	D	E
By department chief's cabinet	35	33	28	38	34
By department coordinating committee	20	19	15	17	21
By specific and non-overlapping assignments	11	14	11	16	15
By unit heads, informally	44	40	34	47	43
Other[b]	7	6	5	6	7
Little or no coordination exists	15	11	15	17	15

a. Multiple responses from a total of 98 units

b. Inter-unit group such as a task force or office memos and publications

Table 8

RDDDE UNITS IN STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION
CHANGED AND/OR EXPANDED JULY 1 1964 - JULY 1 1970

Alteration	Number
Changed Organization Only	13
Expanded Only	1
Both Changed And Expanded	53
Neither	31
Total units responding	98

Table 9

STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION RECEIVING
A REGULAR OR BIENNIAL ALLOCATION OF
STATE FUNDS FOR RDDDE ACTIVITIES
1969-1970

Activities Funded	SDEs Receiving Regular State Funds[a]	
	Number	Percent
Research	26	84
Development	10	32
Demonstration	13	42
Dissemination	18	58
Evaluation	25	81

[a]A total of 31 states responded to this section of the survey.

Table 10

AUTHORIZATION OF STATE FUNDS FOR RDDDE
IN STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION
1969-1970

Authorizing body	Percent of SDEs [a]				
	R	D	D	D	E
State law	12	10	5	7	9
State board and/or Commissioner's (department head's) regulations	9	9	8	6	8
Traditional budget allocations to various administrative units	32	26	17	26	25
Other	1	2	1	1	2

[a]A total of 31 states responded to this section of the survey.

Table 11

STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION RECEIVING REGULAR FUNDING FOR RDDDE ACTIVITIES IN 1969-1970

Activities	SDEs Receiving Regular Allotment State		SDEs Receiving Regular Allotment Federal	
	Number	Percent[a]	Number	Percent[a]
Research	23	70	29	88
Development	19	58	25	76
Demonstration	14	42	17	52
Dissemination	26	79	28	85
Evaluation	22	67	28	85

[a]A total of 33 states responded to this section of the survey.

Table 12

STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION
RECEIVING SPECIAL FUNDS FOR RDDDE PROJECTS
1969-1970

Activities	SDEs Receiving Special Allotment State		SDEs Receiving Special Allotment Federal	
	Number	Percent[a]	Number	Percent[a]
Research	6	18	14	42
Development	7	21	11	33
Demonstration	5	15	10	33
Dissemination	4	12	12	36
Evaluation	3	10	9	27

[a]A total of 33 states responded to this section of the survey.

Table 13

AFFILIATION OF STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION
WITH INTERSTATE AND INTRA-STATE ORGANIZATIONS
1969-1970

Affiliation	Percent of Units Reporting Affiliation in Each Category[a]				
	R	D	D	D	E
With interstate organization for	41	32	15	33	33
Intra-state education council or similar organization for	23	24	21	24	20
Other[b]	2	3	0	1	1

a. Based on total of 98 units

b. Institutes of higher education
Regional Laboratories

Table 14

RDDDE UNITS REPORTING SUPPORT BY
DEPARTMENTAL STATISTICAL SERVICD UNITS,
MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEMS (MIS)
OR STUDENT INFORMATION SYSTEMS (SIS)
IN STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION
1969-1970

System	Percent of RDDDE Units with Support[a]				
	R	D	D	D	E
Statistical Service Unit	48	33	20	35	45
MIS or SIS	36	23	17	27	33

a. Based on a total of 98 units

Table 15

RDDDE ACTIVITIES PERFORMED
BY RDDDE UNITS IN
STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION
1969-1970

Number of Activities a Unit Reports	Number of Units Reporting	Number of Responses				
		R	D	D	D	E
All 5 (RDDDE)	43	43	43	43	43	43
Four of the Five	22	17	20	9	22	20
Three of the Five	16	12	6	4	15	11
Two of the Five	14	6	6	2	8	6
One of the Five	3	1	0	0	1	1
Total units responding	98	79	75	58	89	81
Percent of RDDDE units reporting activity in		81	77	59	91	83

Table 16

KINDS OF TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE
AVAILABLE UPON REQUEST FROM RDDDE UNITS IN
STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION
1969-1970

Service	Percent of Units Providing Technical Assistance[a]				
	R	D	D	D	E
Review of existing efforts in	66	57	46	57	72
Analysis of service needed in	59	52	44	47	68
Design of service program in	53	44	41	45	57
Training of staff in	42	38	32	36	53
Help to implement projects or activity in	56	61	46	50	67
Other[b]	3	3	3	3	3

a. Based on a total of 98 units

b. Preparing reports

Table 17

KIND OF SYSTEMATIC SERVICE AVAILABLE
UPON REQUEST IN
STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION
1969-1970

Kind of Systematic Services	Percent of Units Providing Service[a]				
	R	D	D	D	E
Evaluation of existing program in	34	39	31	29	45
Determination of program needs in	34	39	25	29	41
Training of program staff in	19	23	15	15	23
Actual program implementation	18	22	22	16	24
Other	0	0	0	1	1

a. Based on a total of 98 units

Table 18

UNITS PROVIDING SYSTEMATIC EVALUATION AND DISSEMINATION OF RDDDE ACTIVITIES DONE BY AGENCIES OUTSIDE OF THE STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION OTHER THAN UPON REQUEST

1969-1970

Service	Percent of Units Providing Service[a]				
	R	D	D	D	E
Evaluation	3	4	2	1	10
Dissemination	19	19	19	25	16

[a]Based on a total of 98 units

Table 19

RECIPIENTS OF TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE
FROM RDDDE UNITS IN STATE DEPARTMENTS OF
EDUCATION
1969-1970

Recipients	Percent of Units Providing Assistance to Recipients[a]				
	R	D	D	D	E
Other units within the department	54	45	35	45	55
Regional, intermediate or multi-district educational units	45	40	37	45	49
Local school districts	64	61	57	62	73
Other state governmental units	24	29	20	30	24
Other intermediate or local governmental units	18	17	14	17	19
Non-governmental units such as teacher organizations, non-public schools	30	34	29	39	33

[a]Based on a total of 98 units

Table 20

RECIPIENTS OF SYSTEMATIC SERVICE FROM RDDDE UNITS IN STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION 1969-1970

Recipient	Percent of Units Providing Systematic Service to Recipients[a]				
	R	D	D	D	E
Other units within the department	32	28	21	31	35
Regional, intermediate or multi-district educational units	29	30	26	29	31
Local school districts	40	44	39	45	52
Other state governmental units	9	10	10	15	13
Other intermediate or local governmental units	7	9	6	7	10
Non-governmental units such as teacher organizations, non-public schools	16	21	19	24	20

[a]Based on a total of 98 units

Table 21

STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION DISPENSING
STATE FUNDS FOR RDDDE THROUGH GRANT AWARDS
OR CONTRACTS
1969 - 1970

Activities	Percent of Departments Dispensing Funds for RDDDE Activities[a]
Research	29
Development	27
Dissemination	24
Demonstration	15
Evaluation	25

[a] A total of 31 states responded to this section of the survey

Table 22

AGE RANGE OF RDDDE PERSONNEL
IN RDDDE UNITS IN
STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION
1969-1970

Age Range	Number	Percent
30 years or under	79	22
31 to 40 years	132	37
41 to 50 years	93	26
Over 50 years	50	14
Total respondents	354	99[a]

a. Rounded numbers

Table 23

NUMBER OF MALE AND FEMALE PERSONNEL IN RDDDE UNITS IN STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION 1969-1970

Sex	Number	Percent
Male	280	79
Female	74	21
Total respondents	354	100

Table 24

EDUCATION LEVEL OF RDDDE PERSONNEL
IN RDDDE UNITS IN
STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION
1969-1970

Education Level	Number	Percent
Post high school	3	1
Bachelor	72	20
Master	170	48
Doctorate	98	28
Post-Doctorate	11	3
Total respondents	354	100

Table 25

ACTIVITIES IN PAST FIVE YEARS
OF RDDDE PERSONNEL IN
STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION
1969-1970

Activity	Number	Percent
Directed or coordinated special projects[a]	155	34
Held position of leadership in professional organization or activity[b]	78	17
Directed or coordinated multi-state project	48	11
Developed multi-state project	39	9
Other	137	30
Total responses	457[c]	101[d]

a. Using funds from other than state sources.

b. Such as those funded under ESEA Title V-503 or with foundation funds.

c. Total respondents 354, some giving multiple responses.

d. Rounded numbers

Table 26

TOTAL WORK EXPERIENCE OF RDDDE PERSONNEL
IN STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION
BY RDDDE FUNCTION
1969-1970

Years	RESEARCH		DEVELOPMENT		DEMONSTRATION		DISSEMINATION		EVALUATION	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
0	51	21	31	16	25	25	62	33	47	25
1	51	21	50	25	21	21	38	20	54	28
2	53	22	52	26	15	15	33	17	32	17
3	37	16	32	16	17	17	25	13	25	13
4	13	5	12	6	6	6	5	3	11	6
5	19	8	11	6	5	5	8	4	7	4
6	4	2	2	1	2	2	3	2	1	1-
7	2	1-[a]	1	1-	2	2	0	0	0	0
8	2	1-	3	2	3	3	3	2	2	1
9	1	1-	1	1-	1	1-	0	0	2	1
10	1	1-	4	2	3	3	7	4	3	2
11+	4	2	1	1-	1	1-	6	3	4	2
Total	238	101[b]	200	103	101	101	190	101	188	100

[a]Less than 1 percent; treated as 1% in deriving column total

[b]Total reflects rounded numbers

Table 27

PERSONNEL TIME ALLOCATED TO
RDDDE ACTIVITIES IN RDDDE UNITS IN
STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION
1969-1970

Percent of Time Spent	Number of Respondents in Each Activity				
	Research	Development	Demonstration	Dissemination	Evaluation
1 - 20	131	93	96	170	136
21 - 40	62	76	19	41	59
41 - 60	43	44	5	20	30
61 - 80	11	11	3	11	18
81 - 100	16	4	2	9	10
Total Responses	263	228	125	251	253
Percent of Respondents[a]	74	62	35	71	71
Full-time Equivalents[b]	75	65	22	55	67

a. Percent of 354 respondents who spend some time on each activity

b. Number of full-time employees it would take to handle the work done by larger numbers of people. It is calculated by multiplying the mid-point of each time range by the number of respondents in that range, and adding those numbers.

Table 28

TIME ALLOCATED BY STAFF MEMBERS TO VARIOUS
JOBS IN RDDDE UNITS IN STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION

1969-1970

Time Allocation	Number	Percent
All management	50	14
Three-fourths management and one-fourth program	39	11
Half management and half program	58	17
One-fourth management and three-fourths program	84	24
All program	103	30
Technician or specialist	14	4
Total respondents	348	100

Table 29

LENGTH OF TIME OF RDDDE PERSONNEL IN PRESENT POSITION IN STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION
1969-1970

Length of Service	Number	Percent
Less than 1 year	101	29
1 to 2 years	144	41
3 to 4 years	66	19
5 to 6 years	23	7
7 to 8 years	7	2
9 to 10 years	5	1
11 to 15 years	5	1
More than 15 years	0	0
Total respondents	351	100

Table 30

SOURCES OF FUNDING FOR RDDDE PERSONNEL IN STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION 1969-1970

Percent of Funding from	Federal Funds		State Funds	
	Number of persons being funded for given percent	Percent of total respondents[a]	Number of persons being funded for given percent	Percent of total respondents[a]
0-9	0	0	2	0
10-19	0	0	8	2
20-29	1	less than 1	18	5
30-39	1	" " "	1	less than 1
40-49	1	" " "	2	" " "
50-59	16	5	15	5
60-69	2	less than 1	2	less than 1
70-79	9	3	2	" " "
80-89	10	3	0	0
90-99	8	2	0	0
100	99	28	99	28
No response	28	8	26	7
Total	175	51[b]	175	49[b]

[a]Total respondents 350

[b]Rounded numbers. Those less than 1 are counted as .5

Table 31

STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION USING
MULTIPLE APPOINTMENT OF RDDDE PERSONNEL
WITH OUTSIDE AGENCIES
1969-1970

Types of Joint Appointments	Number of States with such Appointments	Percent of Total States Responding [a]
Personnel from university faculty	8	21
Student intern from university	5	13
Unspecified multiple appointment	2	10
Total states with personnel having multiple appointments	15	44

[a] A total of 38 states responded to this section of the survey

Table 32

PREVIOUS POSITIONS HELD BY RDDDE PERSONNEL IN STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION 1969-1970

Position	Number	Percent
Within State Department of Education		
Same office but another position	53	15
Same state department but another office	60	17
Total from within SDE	113	32
Outside State Department of Education		
Another state department	10	3
A school district	88	25
A college or university	70	20
A special project or activity[a]	9	3
A regional or nation R & D organization[b]	5	1
A philanthropic foundation	2	less than 1[c]
Other	51	15
No previous job held	3	less than 1
Total from outside SDE	238	68
Total Respondents	351	100

a. For example, national curriculum projects or other federally-funded project activity (ESEA I, III, V; VEA, etc.)

b. For example, a Regional Education Lab or R & D center

c. Counted as .5

Table 33

SOURCES OF INTRODUCTION FOR RDDDE PERSONNEL TO STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION 1969-1970

Source of Introduction	Number	Percent
Member of the department	195	55
Former member of the department	20	6
A professor	43	12
A placement service	19	5
Local school district personnel	7	2
Other	69	20
Total respondents	353	100

Table 34

SOURCES WHO STRONGLY INFLUENCED THE DECISION
OF RDDDE PERSONNEL TO JOIN
STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION
1969-1970

Source	Number	Percent
Member of the department	231	59
Former member of the department	24	6
A professor	62	16
A placement service	7	2
Local school district personnel	9	2
Other	59	15
Total responses	392[a]	100

[a]Includes multiple responses

Table 35

RDDDE PERSONNEL INFLUENCED BY PERSONAL FRIENDS TO JOIN THE STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION
1969-1970

Major Influence of Decision to Join SDE Was a Personal Friend	Number	Percent
Yes	125	38
No	207	62
Total respondents	332	100

Table 36

EDUCATION LEVEL OF FORMER
RDDDE STAFF MEMBERS IN
STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION
WHO LEFT SINCE JULY 1, 1969

Educational Level	Number	Percent
Post high school	1	1
Bachelor	8	10
Master	36	43
Doctorate	27	32
Post-Doctorate	5	6
Not specified	6	7
Total separated staff	83	99[a]

a. Rounded numbers

Table 37

REASONS PERSONNEL LEFT RDDDE UNITS IN
STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION
SINCE JULY 1, 1969

Reason	Number of Staff Members for Which Each Reason was Given[a]	Percent
Career advancement	46	34
Higher salary	32	24
More responsibility	21	16
Study toward an advanced degree	9	6
Personal reasons	16	12
Other[b]	11	8
Total responses	135	100

a. Multiple reasons were given for a single separation

b. Includes retirement, involuntary termination, reason unknown

Table 38

EMPLOYMENT TO WHICH FORMER PROFESSIONAL AND TECHNICAL RDDDE STAFF MEMBERS IN STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION WENT AFTER JULY 1, 1969

Employment	Number	Percent
This state education department but to another office	7	8
Another state education department	1	1
A school district	15	18
A college or university	24	29
A philanthropic foundation	1	1
A regional or nation R & D organization	3	4
Special project activity, such as national curriculum project or federally funded activity (ESEA III, V, VEA, etc.)	5	6
A consulting firm or private consultancy	10	12
Do not know	10	12
Not specified	7	8
Total separated staff	83	99 [a]

a. Rounded numbers

Table 39

AVERAGE LENGTH OF SERVICE OF PROFESSIONAL AND TECHNICAL RDDDE·STAFF MEMBERS WHO LEFT ADMINISTRATIVE UNITS IN STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION SINCE JULY 1, 1969

	Average Length of Service
Staff[a]	2.1 Years

[a]76 staff members for whom length of service was specified.

A total of 83 former staff members were discussed in the survey but the length of service was unspecified for seven of them.

APPENDIX G

PROJECT CATALOGUE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPENDIX G

PROJECT CATALOGUE

The following are the 157 projects selected for abstracting out of the 450 submitted. The catalogue is arranged alphabetically by state and project title. The listing provides the following information:

- project title
- project abstract
- whether a report is available
- the responsible state department person and his title
- the responsible division and/or bureau within the state department
- the type of project abbreviated as follows:

  R - Research
  Dv - Development
  Dm - Demonstration
  Ds - Dissemination
  E - Evaluation

- project dates
- cost. Where the cost is not given, the budget was not available.
- name, title and affiliation of the outside contractor, if any

I. STATE CONDUCTED RDDDE ON STATE PROBLEMS AND SERVICES

STATE	PROJECT	TYPE	DURATION	COST($)	OUTSIDE CONTRACTOR
	1. Research, Development, Dissemination				
	DESIGNING EDUCATION FOR THE FUTURE				
Colorado	An eight-state project designed primarily to encourage and help the participating states to assess needs and to plan and effect improvements in education. Report.	R Dv Ds	Jan. 1966- June 1969	1.5 mil.	Edgar L. Morphet, Project Director
	IMPROVING STATE LEADERSHIP IN EDUCATION				
Delaware	A multi-state project designed to use a variety of approaches in helping all state education agencies to modify or improve their roles, functions, relations and services in planning and effecting needed changes in education and in evaluating progress. Report.	R Dv Ds	June 1969- June 1972	800,000	Edgar L. Morphet, Project Director
	2. Research				
	LEADERSHIP FOR LOCAL PROGRAMS BY STATE DEPARTMENT PERSONNEL				
Delaware	A mailed questionnaire was used to determine what leadership for local educational programs was provided by the Department of Public Instruction. Report. Wilmer E. Wise, Director, Division of Research, Planning and Evaluation.	R	March 1969- July 1969	1,000	

STATE	PROJECT	TYPE	DURATION	COST ($)	OUTSIDE CONTRACTOR
	PROPOSING A PLANNING UNIT FOR THE STATE DEPARTMENT				
Delaware	A Governor's Fellow reviewed techniques of educational agencies in other states to determine how the Delaware Department of Public Instruction could implement modern planning strategies. The study resulted in a proposal to develop a planning unit within the Department of Public Instruction. Report. Wilmer E. Wise, Director, Division of Research, Planning and Evaluation.	R	June 1969-Aug. 1969	1,200	
	3. Development				
	DEVELOPING A PROGRAM VALIDATION SYSTEM				
Massachusets	This project was designed to develop a comprehensive program validation accountability system for all ESEA program (Titles I-VIII) in the state. The project encompasses all phases of system development including defining required base line data; translating conceptual goals to performance goals; designing preliminary documents, forms and procedures; defining monitoring information requirements; specifying levels of acceptable performance; specifying management techniques. No Report.	Dv	May 1970-April 1972	180,000	Edward A. Welling, Jr., President, National Education Program Associates

STATE	PROJECT	TYPE	DURATION	COST ($)	OUTSIDE CONTRACTOR
Michigan	DEVELOPING A SYSTEM FOR EXTERNAL FORMS CONTROL As part of an educational information system to assist federal and state administrators to make major decisions, the Department of Education monitored forms and adjusted or eliminated any forms that were ineffective. The activity produced a reference document, the Data Item Index of External Forms, which lists 5,000 items and provides information on frequency of collection, level of collection, whether the item was automated, whether related to an aid program, and whether related to K-12 or higher education. Report. Morley Murphy, Research Consultant, Bureau of Research, Evaluation and Assessment.	Dv	June 1968-1970	88,000	
	4. Evaluation STATE DEPARTMENT INFLUENCE ON NEW INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS				
Delaware	This project evaluated the influence that the staff of the Department of Public Instruction exerted on the initiation and implementation of selected programs in local school districts. Evaluation procedures included a rating questionnaire and structured interviews with selected school principals. Report. Wilmer E. Wise, Director, Division of Research, Planning and Evaluation.	E	April 1969-June 1969	4,000	

STATE	PROJECT	TYPE	DURATION	COST ($)	OUTSIDE CONTRACTOR
	EVALUATING THE EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT EXPENSE PROGRAM				
Florida	Authorized by state law in March, 1968 to meet demands for improvement and innovation, the Education Improvement Expense Program (EIE) provides $1,720 per instruction unit each year for qualifying school districts. To qualify for funds a district must prepare a five-year development and implementation plan for educational improvement, based on state education department criteria, with procedures for annual evaluation and revision. The purpose of this project was to analyze the effectiveness of the program by examining nine district plans in depth, other district plans and evaluation reports, state education department publications, and by interviewing personnel involved. Report.	E	1970	NA	Edgar L. Morphet, Project Director and Lynn Paul Cleary, Assistant Professor of Education, University of South Florida
	STUDY OF FINANCIAL AID				
New York	This project continues research, development, dissemination and evaluation of the amount, type, and method of distribution of state financial aid to school districts. Report. William Burke, Senior Research Analyst, Division of Educational Finance.	E	1958-	120,000	

STATE	PROJECT	TYPE	DURATION	COST ($)	OUTSIDE CONTRACTOR
	EVALUATING PROPOSALS UNDER FEDERAL PROGRAMS				
South Carolina	The Office of Research performs an on-going review of the objectives, the procedures and the evaluation sections of project proposals submitted for funding under ESEA, NDEA, and other federal programs. Any required changes are transmitted to the granting office, which then deals directly with the prospective grantee. No Report. Charles Williams and Jesse Coles, Office of Research and Office of Public Law 89-10.	E	NA	NA	

II. STATE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND SERVICE TO LEA PROGRAMS AND SERVICES

STATE	PROJECT	TYPE	DURATION	COST ($)	OUTSIDE CONTRACTOR
	1. Research, Demonstration, Dissemination, Evaluation				
	THE QUALITY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM				
Maryland	The Quality Improvement Program was initiated to stimulate small-scale research and development efforts with emphasis on projects that involved cooperative efforts between the State Department of Education and the local school systems. Through matching funds, the Quality Improvement Program has assisted local school systems in financing experimental and developmental programs, enabling the local systems to afford specialized help from the Bureau of Educational Research and Field Services of the University of Maryland and other universities. The purpose of the program was to explore new ways to achieve better educational return for money spent. Areas of research have included school reorganization, automated teaching, computerized scheduling, and pupil record-keeping for guidance. Report. James B. League, Consultant in Research, Division of Planning, Research and Evaluation.	R Dm Ds E	1966 70	150,000	

STATE	PROJECT	TYPE	DURATION	COST ($)	OUTSIDE CONTRACTOR
	2. Research, Development, Evaluation, Training				
	INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL ENGINEERING				
Oregon	Sponsored by the Oregon Board of Education, the Institute was established in July 1970 as a center for on-going educational evaluation and planning. Major responsibilities of the Institute include educational audits, development of programs for state and local agencies, assessment of school programs and training of personnel for new programs. Report. Leo Myers, Assistant Superintendent.	R Dv E T	1970-	150,000	
	3. Research, Development, Evaluation				
	THE PILOT STUDIES PROGRAM				
Virginia	Under this program, the State Department provides, to local school divisions doing research and development projects, both consultation in research design, management, statistical analysis, evaluation, and matching funds up to 50 percent of the total project costs. Report. Charles E. Clear, Director, Division of Educational Research and Statistics. Following are descriptions of a few local school district projects which are being done under THE PILOT STUDIES PROGRAM:	R Dv E	1968-	75,000 1 year 1968-70	

STATE	PROJECT	TYPE	DURATION	COST ($)	OUTSIDE CONTRACTOR
	1. "Project VA-LEAD: An Instructional Program to Develop Values, Valuing and Leadership" (Fairfax County)				
Virginia	This project is designed to accelerate the development and refinement of value concepts and the process of valuing among secondary school students, and to promote recognition of student leadership potential. The guidance program and the English and Social Studies curricula are being coordinated toward that end for two experimental 11th and 12th grades groups.		Sept. 1967-June 1970		
	2. "Speech and Language Development in Trainable Mentally Retarded Children" (Hampton City)				
Virginia	The project studies the effect of an intensive language stimulation program on the trainable mentally retarded child's ability to verbalize and conceptualize. It is conducted in four classes of trainable mentally retarded children--two classes as experimental and two as control groups.		Sept. 1969-June 1971		

STATE	PROJECT	TYPE	DURATION	COST ($)	OUTSIDE CONTRACTOR
	3. "The Use of Summaries to Publicize Educational Research Findings among Teachers and Principals" (Richmond City)				
Virginia	This study was designed to determine if the presentation and dissemination of summaries of selected current educational research reports to teachers and principals will result in significant differences in attitude toward the use of the findings. Three hundred teachers and 60 principals were divided into experimental and control groups with the experimental group receiving current research reports. Each participating teacher and principal answered a questionnaire designed to show the amount of time spent reading research.		Sept. 1968-June 1970		
	4. "A Vertical Long-Range Follow-up Study of Pupils Enrolled in a Model Kindergarten Project" (Roanoke)				
Virginia	The purpose of this study was to determine the effects of a Model Kindergarten Project upon the pupils who were involved by following each one through the primary grades. Approximately 400 students were studied.		June 1968-June 1971		

STATE	PROJECT	TYPE	DURATION	COST ($)	OUTSIDE CONTRACTOR
	4. Development				
	COMMUNITY-ORIENTED CHANGE-PROCESS MODEL				
Alaska	This on-going activity stresses community involvement in educational planning and decision-making on the local level. Participants include State Education Department personnel and local citizens, school administrators, faculty and students. This is a cooperative effort with the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory. No Report. Keith J. Anderson, Coordinator, Office of Planning and Research.	Dv	October 1970	35, 0	
	5. Evaluation				
	EDUCATIONAL QUALITY ASSESSMENT				
Pennsylvania	Mandated by the 1963 School District Reorganization Act, this on-going activity aimed to develop procedures for school personnel to use in evaluating their educational programs. The basis for assessment was Pennsylvania's Ten Goals of Quality Education, adopted by the State Board of Education in 1965, with goals defined for student growth in personal and social as well as mental areas. The instruments developed and revised included "Creativeness", "Citizenship", and "Human Achievements". Report. Paul B. Campbell, Director, Office of Research and Statistics.	E	1967-70	659,703	

STATE	PROJECT	TYPE	DURATION	COST ($)	OUTSIDE CONTRACTOR
	6. Training				
	SEMINARS FOR TRAINING LEADERS TO DEVELOP AND USE RESEARCH				
Kentucky	This seminar series, conducted by the State Department of Education and outside consultants, was designed to upgrade the research and development capability of people in positions on a local level throughout the state. Topics covered by the seminars included organizing for research, developing personnel, establishing a strategy for educational change, utilizing research, and upgrading research methodology. Report. Donald E. Elswick, Director, Division of Research.	T	Dec. 1966-June 1967	16,700	
	TRAINING EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH WORKERS				
Maryland	Sixteen lectures and meetings were designed to enhance the understanding and improve the research skills of educational researchers from the Maryland public education agencies. The training project was a cooperative program among the Maryland Department of Education, Maryland local school systems, and the University of Maryland. No Report. Richard K. McKay, Assistant State Superintendent, Division of Planning, Research and Evaluation.	T	Sept. 1966-Jan. 1967	3,535	

III. STATE CONDUCTED RDDDE ON LEA PROGRAMS AND SERVICES

STATE	PROJECT	TYPE	DURATION	COST ($)	OUTSIDE CONTRACTOR
	A. GENERAL EDUCATION				
	1. Research a. Needs Assessment and Status Studies				
Colorado	ASSESSMENT OF EDUCATIONAL NEEDS During the first year of this on-going project, curriculum specialists and evaluation experts wrote year-end performance objectives in nine curricular areas for grades K, 3, 6, 9, and 12. Some of these objectives were then sent to teachers for validation and the results were tested during the spring of 1970. The work was funded under ESEA Title III as part of the state plan. Report. Arthur Olson, Director, Assessment and Evaluation Unit.	R	1969-	55,000	
Delaware	DECLINE IN CATHOLIC SCHOOL ENROLLMENT AND IMPLICATIONS FOR DELAWARE PUBLIC SCHOOLS This report, in response to legislative inquiry, studied enrollments, enrollment trends, instructional personnel, and state costs of the Catholic school system in the state of Delaware. Report. Wilmer E. Wise, Director, Division of Research, Planning and Evaluation.	R	Sept. 1969- Feb. 1970	3,000	

STATE	PROJECT	TYPE	DURATION	COST ($)	OUTSIDE CONTRACTOR
	NEEDS ASSESSMENT				
Florida	This study identified eight areas of critical need and the potential populations to be served in each area. Identification was done by a review of existing sociometric and educational data, a survey of current educational practices in each district of the state, and an opinion poll of students, parents, teachers, administrators, and employers. Report. Richard W. Kurth, Coordinator, Educational Needs Assessment, Bureau of Research.	R	1968-70	NA	
	SHORT-RANGE ASSESSMENT OF EDUCATIONAL NEEDS				
Georgia	This study was designed to determine the short range educational needs in the state. Demographic characteristics, residents' perceptions of educational needs, teaching practices, student achievement, and patterns of organization and administration were analyzed using a matrix of categories including population densities, geographic divisions, and economic factors. Report. William H. Schabacker, Associate Director for Research and Assessment, Division of Planning, Research and Evaluation.	R	1968-69	30,000	

STATE	PROJECT	TYPE	DURATION	COST ($)	OUTSIDE CONTRACTOR
Illinois	STUDY OF RELATIONSHIP OF QUALITY EDUCATION MEASURES The purpose of this study was twofold: to investigate the interrelationship of all input and output measures of quality education; and to determine if knowledge of the input measures significantly increases the prediction of the output measures. The study was performed in randomly selected Illinois school districts for 1968-1969. Report. Leighton Hasen, Assistant Director of Educational Research.	R	Feb.-Dec. 1970	3,000	
Missouri	EDUCATIONAL NEEDS The study examined test performance in school districts and compared this performance to indices usually thought to influence educational product. Other factors examined were financial input, enrollment, course offerings, teacher preparation, and geographic location. Report. Don L. Gann, Director, Title I . ESEA Section.	R	Sept. 1968-June 1970	NA	

STATE	PROJECT	TYPE	DURATION	COST($)	OUTSIDE CONTRACTOR
Nevada	EDUCATIONAL NEEDS Data from various organizational levels, several target populations, and student performance were analyzed according to urban, rural, or remote-rural areas for this assessment of public and nonpublic education throughout Nevada. Report. John R. Gamble, Deputy State Superintendent, State Department Assessment Committee.	R	March 1969-May 1969	14,980	
New Mexico	STATUS OF PUBLIC SCHOOLS, 1969 The report provided parents, citizens, legislators, school personnel, and educational planners with an objective assessment of educational facilities and services in New Mexico schools and an overview of special problems and needs. The Statistics Division compiled various data that had been collected by several divisions within the Department of Education. Background information on the population and economy of the State was included, along with an analysis and interpretation of the data. The report, not intended as a statement of policy or a description of curriculum, was a basis for determining steps necessary to improve the quality of education in the State. Report. Marchia Meeker, Research Associate, Research and Development Services.	R	March 1969-Jan. 1970	NA	

STATE	PROJECT	TYPE	DURATION	COST ($)	OUTSIDE CONTRACTOR
	EDUCATIONAL NEEDS ASSESSMENT				
West Virginia	Twenty-two goals of education developed by State Department staff were translated into 49 measurable objectives with assistance of West Virginia University staff members. The assessment activity was done to determine the current status of education in relation to the twenty-two goals, using a discrepancy model. Report. B.G. Panley and C.O. Humphreys, Assessment, Evaluation and Dissemination Unit.	R	1967	NA	
	VALIDATION OF EDUCATIONAL NEEDS				
West Virginia	The purpose of this project was to determine the most critical educational needs of the state in order to establish criteria to be used in processing applications for State-grant programs. Seventeen critical educational needs identified in the needs assessment phase of the project were submitted for validation to 1,500 lay and professional educators across the state. By using a ranking system, this group of people reduced the number of critical needs to five. Report. C.O. Humphreys, Supervisor, Assessment, Evaluation and Dissemination Unit.	R	1969	NA	

STATE	PROJECT	TYPE	DURATION	COST ($)	OUTSIDE CONTRACTOR
	1. Research b. Curriculum and Instruction				
Kentucky	STATUS AND TRENDS SERIES: II, THE CHANGING PATTERN OF MATHEMATICS IN KENTUCKY HIGH SCHOOL This report traces the changing pattern in high school mathematics from 1957 to 1966, showing that through cooperative state and local efforts, curriculum areas and instructional processes have been significantly improved and expanded. The Status and Trends Series also includes reports on education in science, social studies, foreign languages, English language, and business. Report. Donald E. Elswick, Director, Division of Research.	R	1968	2,000	
Maine	"READY OR NOT", EARLY SCHOOL ADMISSION PROGRAM State department personnel and members of the State Committee on School Entrance Age investigated and evaluated programs of early school admission, experimented with various testing techniques for school entrance and placement, and made recommendations for schools in Maine. Report. Bureau of Elementary Education.	R	May 1966-Dec. 1966	13,333	Richard Babb, Director, of Elementary Education, Auburn, Maine

STATE	PROJECT	TYPE	DURATION	COST ($)	OUTSIDE CONTRACTOR
Missouri	HEALTH EDUCATION STUDY A doctoral candidate conducted this study to determine the following status of health education programs in Missouri schools, in terms of teacher characteristics, teacher preparation programs, and pupil access to instruction; the effectiveness of the programs, in terms of student scores on selected health education evaluation instruments compared with national norms; and the relative effect on students of eight different organized health curricula. Report. Robert M. Taylor, Director, Health, Physical Education, and Safety Section.	R	June 1968-Aug. 1970	7,600	
New Jersey	WHO FAILED? The study focused on 80 students who had failed one or more courses at the ninth grade level. Interviews were conducted with those students, parents, and their teachers. School textbooks used by the students were evaluated for level of reading difficulty, and the cumulative academic and health records of the students were examined. Report. Robert S. Fleming, Assistant Commissioner, Divison of Curriculum and Instruction.	R	1965-66	NA	

STATE	PROJECT	TYPE	DURATION	COST ($)	OUTSIDE CONTRACTOR
Missouri	HEALTH EDUCATION STUDY A doctoral candidate conducted this study to determine the following status of health education programs in Missouri schools, in terms of teacher characteristics, teacher preparation programs, and pupil access to instruction; the effectiveness of the programs, in terms of student scores on selected health education evaluation instruments compared with national norms; and the relative effect on students of eight different organized health curricula. Report. Robert M. Taylor, Director, Health, Physical Education, and Safety Section.	R	June 1968-Aug. 1970	7,600	
New Jersey	WHO FAILED? The study focused on 80 students who had failed one or more courses at the ninth grade level. Interviews were conducted with those students, parents, and their teachers. School textbooks used by the students were evaluated for level of reading difficulty, and the cumulative academic and health records of the students were examined. Report. Robert S. Fleming, Assistant Commissioner, Divison of Curriculum and Instruction.	R	1965-66	NA	

STATE	PROJECT	TYPE	DURATION	COST($)	OUTSIDE CONTRACTOR
	BILINGUAL EDUCATION CENTER				
New Mexico	The center was one of four experimental bilingual programs for children of minority groups operated in widely separated areas of New Mexico. Services for Spanish-speaking children were provided on a research basis, using two experimental groups and a control group. Report. Division of Instructional Services.	R	1967-68 1969-70	260,000	Mary Kieth, Las Cruces School Distri Las Cruces, New Mexico
	EFFECTIVESS OF RACIAL BALAN PROGRAMS PHASE I: RESEARCH STRATEGY AND INSTRUMENTS				
New York	Riverside Research Institute was contracted to test the feasibility of evaluating the short- and long-term psychological, sociological, and academic effectiveness of providing supplementary funds to school districts to correct racial imbalance. The Research report includes a battery of age-graded instruments to measure non-cognitive outcomes of racial balance or imbalance, and a research strategy for the evaluation of program to correct racial imbalance. Report. Bureau of Department Programs Evaluation.	R	May-Dec. 1969	17,828	Bertram L. Koslin, Manager of Educational Projects, Riverside Research Insitute

STATE	PROJECT	TYPE	DURATION	COST ($)	OUTSIDE CONTRACTOR
	EFFECTS OF PARENTAL PARTICIPATION ON FIRST GRADE ACHIEVEMENT				
New York	The study sought to determine whether first grade pupils whose parents participated in their education had higher reading achievement than those whose parents did not. It also sought to determine what correlations existed among reading achievement; reading readiness; intelligence; and the occupations and schooling of the parents. Report. Bureau of School and Cultural Research.	R	1967-69	27,934	Florence Heisler, Brooklyn College
	RACIAL AND SOCIAL CLASS ISOLATION IN THE SCHOOLS				
New York	This project done for the State Board of Regents studied the following areas: policy, programs, and decisions on school desegregation in the state; population patterns and segregation in the schools; relationship of social class and ethnicity to intellectual and educational development; major studies of racial and social class isolation in the school; integration at the local level; compensatory integration and education. Recommendations were made to help create equal educational opportunities. Report. Robert P. O'Reilly, Bureau Chief, Bureau of School and Cultural Research.	R	June 1969-Dec. 1970	60,000	

STATE	PROJECT	TYPE	DURATION	COST ($)	OUTSIDE CONTRACTOR
	DIALECT AND ITS IMPLICATIONS IN EDUCATION				
Texas	For two years doctoral candidates taped free conversations of children of various ages, social classes, races, geographical regions, and backgrounds, urban and rural. Linguistics and anthropologists studied and reported on the sharply varying dialects and behavior patterns which a teacher would be likely to encounter. Particular attention was paid to the effect of race upon classroom learning. In order to adapt existing instructional materials to provide for pupil variation to change teachers' attitudes toward differences in students, an in-service course for teachers was designed and presented four times. The course included sixty hours of instructions in culture, folklore, and linguistics. The materials used were prepared for wider dissemination. Report. Mary Galvan, Program Director for English Language Arts, Division of Program Development.	R Dv	March 1967-70	50,000	
	READING FOR MEXICAN-AMERICAN STUDENTS				
Texas	This pilot program tested the hypothesis that teaching Spanish-speaking children initially to read in Spanish while teaching them to speak English as a second language is a better means of assuring proficiency in reading than teaching them initially to read in English. No Report.	R	Feb. 1968-69		Dana Williams, Superintendent, Corpus Christi Independent School District, Box 110, Corpus Christis, Texas

STATE	PROJECT	TYPE	DURATION	COST ($)	OUTSIDE CONTRACTOR
	1. Research c. Personnel Training and Performance				
	PROJECTED NEEDS FOR TEACHERS				
Florida	The activity collected yearly information from accreditation reports and pupil attendance records and transferred the information into a computer in order to project the need for teachers in Florida for the next ten years. No Report. Fred Daniel, Associate for Planning and Coordination, Staff of Commissioner.	R	May 1969-70	12,000	
	TEACHERS AS AGENTS OF CHANGE				
New Jersey	Recipients in 1968-69 of "minigrants", part of the New Jersey Teacher Innovation Program, were studied to examine the role of the classroom teacher as an agent of change. An investigation, by questionnaire and site-visits, determined the characteristics of the recipients and the projects they conducted. The investigation also determined the effect of the projects on students, teachers, administrators, clients, and on the "minigrant" recipients themselves. In addition, the investigation determined how information on the projects had been disseminated. No Report. William M. Phillips, Jr., Director, Office of Research.	R	1969-70	8,946	Thomas Adams

STATE	PROJECT	TYPE	DURATION	COST ($)	OUTSIDE CONTRACTOR
	DESIRABLE USE FOR THE NATIONAL TEACHER EXAMINATION				
Virginia	The project studied several academic, attitudinal, and socio-economic variables in order to determine acceptable and desirable uses for the National Teacher Examination and other measurements of teacher behavior. No Report. Charles E. Clear and Joseph P. Roberts, Division of Educational Research and Statistics.	R	1968-70	25,000	
	USE OF TEACHER TIME				
Virginia	Through a questionnaire sent to a representative sample of teacher in the state, the project studied the amount of time public school teachers spent on instructional and non-instructional duties. most teachers, it was found, spent seven hours at school, one of which was spent on clerical duties. Most teachers spent an additional two or three hours at home preparing lessons or reviewing pupils' work. The study recommended that clerical assistance and teacher aides be provided and efficiently used, that centralized pupil accounting systems be established in schools, and that policies governing the use of teacher time for all non-instructional duties be reassessed periodically. Report. Charles E. Clear, Director, and Alton L. Taylor, Supervisor, Division of Educational Research and Statistics.	R	1965-Dec. 1966	10,000	

STATE	PROJECT	TYPE	DURATION	COST ($)	OUTSIDE CONTRACTOR
	1. Research d. Student Behavior				
	TEACHER "PROBLEM" SURVEY				
Delaware	Through analysis of a questionnaire answered by a random sample of Delaware teachers, the problems teachers identified were ranked in order of importance as part of a study to determine if student discipline was a major problem in the Delaware school system. Report. Wilmer E. Wise, Director, Division of Research, Planning and Evaluation.	R	Feb. 1969-March 1969	100	
	PROCEDURES USED BY HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS REGARDING STUDENT USE OF TOBACCO, ALCOHOL, NARCOTICS AND DRUGS				
Missouri	The study, performed by a doctoral candidate, had three objectives: to ascertain the extent of the problem of student use of tobacco, alcohol, narcotics, and drugs; to identify administrative procedures regarding this problem; and to generalize in order to recommend action for schools and administrators. Report. Robert M. Taylor, Director, Health, Physical Education and Safety Section.	R	Jan. 1969-May 1969	800	

STATE	PROJECT	TYPE	DURATION	COST ($)	OUTSIDE CONTRACTOR
New Mexico	HEALTH BEHAVIOR INVENTORY The project scored and analyzed a health behavior inventory that had been given to a 15 per cent sample of New Mexico's 5th, 8th and 11th grade students. No Report. Richard Tonegan, Comprehensive State Health Planning and Development Services.	R	April 1970-June 1970	1,500	
Virginia	EDUCATIONAL AND OCCUPATIONAL ASPIRATIONS OF HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS Following a preliminary analysis of data from questionnaires completed by approximately 95 percent of all high school seniors in the state providing information on their future plans and factors influencing those plans, three areas were selected for statistical analysis: the differences in background and aspiration between students in public and private schools, between males and females, and between students who planned to attend college and those who did not; the influences on students' post-high school plans; and the background and high school achievement of those students who applied to college but did not attend, compared with those who did plan to attend. Report. Charles E. Clear, Director, Division of Educational Research and Statistics.	R	1967-69	50,000	

STATE	PROJECT	TYPE	DURATION	COST ($)	OUTSIDE CONTRACTOR
Washington	SMOKING AND HEALTH Public school students in the 6th, 9th and 12th grades were surveyed to determine their smoking behavior, attitude, knowledge and participation in school health education activities. Statistics were compiled from the nearly 19,000 responses. The data should provide a baseline for future assessment of smoking behavior and assist educators in selecting materials for health education programs. Report. Harry App, Coordinator, Smoking and Health Program, State Department of Health.	R	1967-68	30,000	
	1. Research e. Community Involvement				
Wyoming	CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE A degree candidate at the University of Wyoming studied periodical literature pertaining to a citizens advisory committee. References were divided into categories: objectives and organization of a citizens committee; accomplishments of a committee; recommended uses of a committee; concerns of a committee with respect to adult education and vocational education; and the relation of a citizens' committee to curriculum planning. The references were annotated, summarized, and presented to help an educator form an advisory committee which would meet the ·ific needs of the community in which he liv Report. Research Coordinating Unit.	R	NA	NA	Robert S. Wilmeth, Graduate Assistant, University of Wyoming

STATE	PROJECT	TYPE	DURATION	COST ($)	OUTSIDE CONTRACTOR
	CASE HISTORY OF AN URBAN COMMUNITY SCHOOL				
New Jersey	Through a descriptive and analytic case history of the founding of the Springfield Avenue Community School in Newark, the project was designed to determine the aspects of instiutional cooperation and other factors which are pertinent to the establishment, structure, and organization of an urban community school. No Report. Joseph M. Conforti, Office of Research and Development.	R	March 1970-Nov. 1970	4,800	
	1. Research f. Extended School Year				
	FEASIBILITY OF RESCHEDULED SCHOOL YEAR PLAN				
Delaware	The purpose of this project was to study re-scheduled school year plans in order to find a design that could be adopted for Delaware public schools. Report. Wilmer E. Wise, Director, Division of Research, Planning and Evaluation.	R	Oct. 1968-April 1969	30,000	

STATE	PROJECT	TYPE	DURATION	COST ($)	OUTSIDE CONTRACTOR
	EXTENDED SCHOOL YEAR				
New York	Ten school districts and two schools for handicapped children participated in the testing of designs for a rescheduled school year. The "summer segment" and the "continuous learning year" were thoroughly investigated. The "overlapping cycle" design, with five groups attending school in cycles of eight to nine weeks with two weeks vacation intervening, was the final schedule tested. Report. NA.	R	1963-70	1.5 mil.	
	1. Research g. Facilities				
	AIR CONDITIONING EXISTING SCHOOLS				
Florida	The project established climatic zones, identified utility rates, evaluated air conditioning systems, and established procedures for using such data for the purpose of air conditioning existing schools effectively and economically. No Report. Charles E. Chick, Chief, Bureau of School Facilities.	R	June 1969-Dec. 1970	18,000	

STATE	PROJECT	TYPE	DURATION	COST ($)	OUTSIDE CONTRACTOR
	PROMISE AND PERFORMANCE OF SCHOOLHOUSE SYSTEMS 1A				
Florida	The project assembled information to determine if schools constructed under a systems method were more functional, adaptable, more economically or quickly built than were conventionally constructed schools. Report. Harold L. Cramer, Bureau of School Facilities.	R	March 1969-July 1969	3,000	
	1. Research h. Follow-up Studies				
	HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATE FOLLOW-UP				
Maryland	To study the relationships between a graduate's perceptions of his high school experience and his needs and plans in the post-high school environment, all 1970 graduates from both public and non-public secondary schools were given a 50 item optical scan questionnaire for electronic processing. The first page of the instrument was administered before graduation, the remaining four pages administered to the graduate by mail in December following graduation. Each student supplied academic and demographic information, post-high school status, plans and activities, and his evaluation of guidance, subject instruction, and career preparation he had received in high school. No Report. Marinus A. Kip. Specialist in Evaluation, Vocational Education Research Coordinating Section, Division of Planning, Research, and Evaluation.	R	Nov. 1969-March 1971	5,000	

STATE	PROJECT	TYPE	DURATION	COST ($)	OUTSIDE CONTRACTOR
	STATE-WIDE FOLLOW-UP OF 1965 HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATES				
Missouri	To provide for district-wide and state-wide assessments, this study collected data on graduates from Missouri high schools to determine where they were three years after graduation. Graduates were questioned to determine how many were in the field for which they trained, and what opinions they had on the high school curriculum. Report. Charles G. Foster, Director, Guidance and Counseling Section.	R	Jan. 1967-June 1968	34,000	
	SUMMER DROPOUTS				
New Jersey	With a 99.8 percent response to a questionnaire sent to principals in all New Jersey public schools, the report was able to provide and analyze statistical data which will enable local district and school personnel to study summer dropout characteristics and patterns in order to identify future dropouts and institute corrective, preventive, or remedial measures. The report is the fifth in a continuing study to gather pertinent facts for use in predicting dropout trends. Report. M. Jack Krupnick, Research Assistant.	R	Sept.-Oct. 1970	NA	

STATE	PROJECT	TYPE	DURATION	COST ($)	OUTSIDE CONTRACTOR
	CHARACTERISTICS RELATED TO COLLEGE ATTENDANCE				
New York	High school seniors from selected public schools were tested on 25 variables prior to graduation. A follow-up questionnaire determined which students had subsequently entered college, and variables related to college attendance were analyzed. Report. G. Geraldine Dickson, Associate in Education Research, Bureau of Educational Research.	R	1968-69	NA	
	A TEN-YEAR FOLLOW-UP OF YOUNG WOMEN				
Virginia	After obtaining information from high school records, questionnaires were mailed to 20 per cent of all girls who had been enrolled in the 10th grade of Virginia high schools in 1954-55. The study gathered information and opinions about education, family, occupation, employment, preparation for homemaking, homemaking practices, problems, needs, and feelings. The study recommended that better preparation for homemaking and better preparation for home economics occupations be more available to both secondary students and young married women at the post-high school level. Report. Rosa H. Loving, State Supervisor of Home Economics Education, Division of Vocational Education.	R	1965-66	4,000	Beth C. Jordan, Professor of Home Educat: Virginia Polytechnics Institute, Blacksburg, Virginia

STATE	PROJECT	TYPE	DURATION	COST ($)	OUTSIDE CONTRACTOR
	2. Development EFFECT OF INDIAN HISTORY AND CULTURE LESSONS UPON INDIAN AND NON-INDIAN STUDENTS				
Maine	The purpose of this project was to determine if attitudes of children, both Passamaquoddy Indian and non-Indian, could be changed through a series of lessons and video tapes on Indian history. There was evidence that Indian children had no sense of or pride in their cultural history, and consequently lacked a positive self image. A series of videotaped lessons on Indian history and culture were developed and previewed by the Joint Tribal Council. They were then shown to Indian and non-Indian students in grades four, five, and six. Tests were given to experimental and control groups both before and after the lessons. Results showed that children receiving the lessons had significant changes of attitude and that changes were greater among Indian children than among White children. Report. Joseph Pecoraro, Consultant-Social Studies, ESEA, Title IV.	Dv E	Oct. 1969- July 1970	14,090	

STATE	PROJECT	TYPE	DURATION	COST ($)	OUTSIDE CONTRACTOR
	PRIMARY-PRESCHOOL EDUCATION FOR THE CULTURALLY DISADVANTAGED				
Pennsylvania	With Ford Foundation assistance, a nursery-kindergarten-primary project was conducted with culturally disadvantaged children, using social workers from the Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare. Tests in the project's fifth year showed that the program's diagnostic, team-teaching, nongrade approach resulted in significant progress in language, thinking, and measured intelligence. Children and their parents had a favorable attitude toward school. The same approach was continued and refined in the sixth and final year of the project, and test results were similarly encouraging. Report. Frank M. Durkee, Director, Division of Higher Research, Bureau of Research.	Dv E	1963-64 - 1968-69	500,000	
	DIAGNOSTIC-PRESCRIPTIVE KINDERGARTEN INSTRUCTION				
California	The purpose of this project was to plan a task-oriented kindergarten program to help children acquire essential skills which underlie academic learnings, particularly reading. This project proposal is a request for a planning grant to help develop a diagnostic inventory to identify each child's assets and deficits in performing specific learning tasks, and to develop prescriptive activities to correspond to pupil needs as indicated by the diagnostic inventory. Report. Educational Resources Agency.	Dv	June 1968	107,981	Paul Salmon, District Superintendent, Sacramento City Unified School District

STATE	PROJECT	TYPE	DURATION	COST ($)	OUTSIDE CONTRACTOR
	INSTRUMENTS AND PROCEDURES TO MEASURE THE COMPETENCE OF MIDDLE SCHOOL TEACHERS				
Florida	The University of Florida, through the Division of Universities, was contracted to create and field test instruments and procedures to measure the competence of middle school teachers. The instruments were based on guidelines for preparation of middle school teachers that had been adopted by the Teacher Education Advisory Council. Instructional procedures for training people in use of the instruments were also created. The University paid for the first of three field tests and the Division of Elementary and Secondary Education paid for the second and third field tests. Revision was done by representatives from the Bureau of Curriculum and Instruction, the Bureau of Research and the Bureau of Teacher Education, Certification, and Accreditation. No Report. Bureau of Teacher Education, Certification, and Accreditation.	Dv	1970-71	19,950	Gordon Lawrence, College of Education, C & I, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida
	NEEDS ASSESSMENT IN THE AFFECTIVE DOMAIN				
Kansas	This project was a cooperative effort by Title III sections of various states to develop materials and instruments for use in determining the "self-concept" of youngsters. No Report.	Dv	July 1970-Jan. 1971	3,000	James Popham, Behavioral Objectives Exchange, University of California at Los Angeles

STATE	PROJECT	TYPE	DURATION	COST ($)	OUTSIDE CONTRACTOR
	TEACHING ABOUT COMMUNISM				
Kentucky	An advisory commission on teaching communism was established with teachers and administrators who had attended Vanderbilt University Institute on Communism and Constitutional Democracy. The commission developed and evaluated, in cooperation with Catherine Spaulding College and Channel 15, a resource guide to two semesters of in-service training via television. The commission updated the guide for a student series shown on the state-wide television network. Report. Martha R. Ellison, Coordinator of Curriculum Development, Office of Curriculum Development.	Dv	1967-70	20,000	
	DEVELOPMENT OF A TEACHER AIDE TRAINING PROGRAM				
New Jersey	Two hundred and fifty persons, drawn largely from low-income minority groups, were trained on-site by a team assigned to the New Jersey Early Childhood Learning Development Center in Newark. Trainees acquired work-related skills in Language Arts and Mathematics while participating in a career-oriented program for which Essex College granted college credits. Training manuals, tests, and video tapes were produced for state-wide use in further programs. Report. Joseph F. McSweeney, Director, Division of Research, Planning, Evaluation and Program Development.	Dv	1969-71	170,000	

STATE	PROJECT	TYPE	DURATION	COST ($)	OUTSIDE CONTRACTOR
	INDIVIDUAL PRESCRIBED INSTRUCTION SYSTEM FOR ADULT BASIC EDUCATION				
Nevada	The project's aim was to develop, in cooperation with Research For Better Schools, Inc., individually prescribed instructional materials and to adapt them for adults. No Report. John W. Bunten, Director, Vocational-Technical Education Branch.	Dv	July 1969-June 1970	161,584	
	TEXAS MIGRANT EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT				
Texas	The overall objective of this project is to develop, test and evaluate programs, instructional material, learning systems teaching methods and ancillary services for children of migrant agricultural workers. Special features of the project include development of Parent-School-Community involvement, a teacher aide program, and a comprehensive data bank on migrants in Texas. The project is a cooperative effort between the state department of education and Southwest Educational Development Laboratory. Report. Migrant and Pre-School Programs.	Dv E	March 1968-73	180,000 (first 3 years)	Tony A.E. Garcia, Director of Texas Migrant Education Development Center

STATE	PROJECT	TYPE	DURATION	COST ($)	OUTSIDE CONTRACTOR
	PROGRAMMING A CONTINUOUS SCHOOL YEAR				
Virginia	The purpose of this on-going project is to develop model plans for expanding the school year, which local schools are encouraged to try. No Report. Charles E. Clear and Joseph P. Roberts, Division of Educational Research and Statistics.	Dv	Dec. 1967-70	60,000	
	3. Demonstration				
	INDIVIDUALIZING INSTRUCTION THROUGH A LEARNER-CENTERED, MULTI-MEDIA APPROACH				
Texas	Centers, operating in four different schools in three different school districts, demonstrated methods of individualizing instruction by: adapting instructional media for use by children, rather than only by teachers; encouraging team-teaching; and by helping teachers to institute nongraded plans of organization. The project had many implications for teacher training, both in-service and pre-service, and a strong research component directed at discovering exactly what advantages accrued to pupils, teachers, and school through the use of such techniques. No Report.	Dm	March 1969-June 1969	65,000	H.H. Witner, Assistant Superintendent Austin Independent Schoc District, Austin, Texas

STATE	PROJECT	TYPE	DURATION	COST ($)	OUTSIDE CONTRACTOR
	4. Dissemination a. Systems				
	SPREAD--STATE PROGRAMS REVITALIZING EDUCATION AND DIFFUSION				
Colorado	Given evidence that small rural schools were falling behind urban schools, SPREAD was designed as a five-year effort four-state joint endeavor to improve the education of children in sparsely populated, remote areas. Planning phase activities centered in Colorado, but three other states, Utah, Washington and Wyoming will have their own action program. Rather than simply exporting centrally-developed innovations, the project stresses local selection and development of improved practices. A major mission of SPREAD is to develop a better method of diffusing innovations to small rural schools. No Report. Edwin P. Hildebrand, Office Management Services, Dissemination and Diffusion Unit.	Ds	1969-74	113,990	
	PLAN FOR ESTABLISHING A RESEARCH INFORMATION CENTER IN THE STATE DEPARTMENT				
Delaware	This project established a system to provide the staff of the Department of Public Instruction with access to new knowledge and practice across the country. Report. Wilmer E. Wise, Director, Division of Research, Planning and Evaluation.	Ds	Feb. 1969-June 1969	5,000	

STATE	PROJECT	TYPE	DURATION	COST ($)	OUTSIDE CONTRACTOR
	DISSEMINATION OF EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION PROGRAM--DEEP				
Kansas	The DEEP project resulted from the desire to disseminate the findings of the state-wide needs assessment and to provide information for continuous assessment. No Report.	Ds	June 1970-Jan. 1971	14,000	Stanley Laughlin, Kansas State Teachers College, Emphoria, Kansas
	MODEL RESEARCH DISSEMINATION ON SYSTEM				
North Carolina	Conitnuing work they had begun earlier at a University, the project directors, with a private consultant, planned a model system for making research findings readily accessible to teachers and program decision-makers in the public school system. The model system had three components: intensive field services to four representative areas throughout the state to encourage awareness, interest, and competence in research utilization; a Research and Information Center to solicit, receive, and service requests for information from the four areas and the State Department staff; a computerized retrieval system for information in the ERIC files. The project directors also hoped to develop interstate cooperation in the use of the retrieval system and feedback relationships with ERIC Central and the Clearinghouses. No Report. William J. Brown, Jr., and Robert C. Evans, Jr., Division of Research.	Ds	1970-71	50,000	

STATE	PROJECT	TYPE	DURATION	COST($)	OUTSIDE CONTRACTOR
Pennsylvania	PRIMES--PENNSYLVANIA RETRIEVAL OF INFORMATION FOR MATHEMATICS EDUCATION SYSTEM PRIMES used modern technology to provide local school districts with information needed for better curriculum decisions in elementary mathematics. The data base of PRIMES consists of the following: a curriculum file with descriptive and analytical information from each lesson of 20 published basal mathematical series which is on microfilm aperture cards, indexed, and made available through computer printout; an analysis of 140 16mm mathematics teaching films used in Pennsylvania; a content and behavioral analysis of each test item on all forms of the most commonly used standardized tests; and a file of 250 published research studies in elementary mathematics. Report. Emanuel Berger and Doris Creswell, Research Assoicates, Bureau of Research.	Ds	1965-70	193,654	

STATE	PROJECT	TYPE	DURATION	COST ($)	OUTSIDE CONTRACTOR
	PILOT DISSEMINATION PROGRAM				
South Carolina	The Research Information Unit, funded through the 1968 Vocational Education Amendments to Title III, operates as part of the Office of Research. The unit disseminates to all school districts research data that has been placed in a readily usable form. Two dissemination specialists serve in centers in selected target areas of the state. These specialists encourage in-depth utilization of research findings by assisting local school districts to identify and investigate their local educational problems and by then assisting the unit to provide the local school districts with the information they need. No Report. W.E. Ellis, Director, Office of Research.	Ds	July 1970-Dec. 1971	150,000	
	COOPERATIVE DISSEMINATION PROJECT				
Texas	During its final year the project continued to operate a supplementary education center designed to obtain the knowledge and information yielded annually through the research efforts of government, industry and education and to recast that knowledge into language usable in the educational system. No Report.	Ds	1968-69	200,000	Huelyn Laycock, Executive Director, Region XVI Education Service Center, Amarillo, Texas

STATE	PROJECT	TYPE	DURATION	COST ($)	OUTSIDE CONTRACTOR
	MODEL PATTERNS OF DISSEMINATION				
Texas	Project RA-TOD (Research Application-Techniques of Dissemination), conducted in cooperation with Texas A & M University, evaluated the effectiveness of various methods of disseminating information about new educational practices. Dissemination pieces and techniques were designed, and evaluation instruments were conducted to measure the relative effectiveness of each. During 1970, the project's second year, the focus was on disseminating information regarding early childhood education. No Report.	Ds	Sept. 1969-Aug. 1970	49,945	Von Rhea Beane, Executive Director, Region VII Education Service Center, Kilgore, Texas
	4. Dissemination b. Publications				
	FOLLOW THROUGH COORDINATION WITH TITLE I				
Arkansas	This project is designed to infuse ideas and approaches from Follow Through into Title I programs. This is done by on-site visits, workshops, conferences, special publications, and a film featuring Follow Through emphasis on early childhood education. In addition the project provides an exchange program for children from culturally isolated rural and inner city areas. Report. Sara Murphy, Coordinator of Dissemination and Follow Through.	Ds	Nov. 1969-Jan. 1971	24,228	

STATE	PROJECT	TYPE	DURATION	COST ($)	OUTSIDE CONTRACTOR
	USER REQUIREMENTS FOR K-12 BUILDINGS				
Florida	The project assembled, for use in planning adaptable and economical elementary and secondary school buildings, data on all learning theories, instructional methods, and environmental factors such as light, sound, color, temperature, and furniture that effect character and design of a school. No Report. Harold L. Cramer, Bureau of School Facilities.	Ds	1969-70	8,000	
	ABSTRACTS OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH				
Maryland	Published yearly since 1965, the "Abstracts" present selected aspects of research findings that might be helpful in the improvement of instructional programs in Maryland. Graduate students have assisted with locating and abstracting research studies. Each issue was intended as a source book of current studies, stimulating thinking and directing attention to representative inquiries into educational practices, not as an exhaustive presentation of research findings. Report. James B. League, Consultant in Research, Division of Planning, Research and Evaluation.	Ds	1965-70	26,500	

STATE	PROJECT	TYPE	DURATION	COST ($)	OUTSIDE CONTRACTOR
	INFORMATION RELEVANT TO KINDERGARTEN PROGRAMS				
New Mexico	Tl. project collected information and compiled a report on the historical development of kindergarten in the United States, the relationship of kindergarten to dropouts and to welfare caseloads, and the relationship of kindergarten attendance and to subsequent promotion or retention in the primary grades. Report. Marchia Meeker, Research Associate, Research and Development Services.	Ds	April 1970-Jan. 1971	NA	
	ANXIETY AND SCHOOL RELATED INTERVENTIONS				
New York	The report presents a selective review of literature on anxiety theory and research, along with suggestions for programs to alleviate or capitalize on aspects of anxiety that affect school performance. Report. Bureau of School and Cultural Research.	Ds	1969-70	6,200	Beeman N. Phillips, University of Texas at Austin

STATE	PROJECT	TYPE	DURATION	COST ($)	OUTSIDE CONTRACTOR
	5. Evaluation				
	APPROACHES TO FIRST GRADE ENGLISH READING INSTRUCTION FOR CHILDREN FROM SPANISH-SPEAKING HOMES				
Colorado	This project had two objectives: to test the effectiveness of three reading approaches for first grade Spanish-speaking children; to identify appropriate materials and techniques for teaching reading to such children in an integrated classroom. Following a month of pretesting, 29 integrated first grade classrooms undertook one of the experimental reading approaches for 28 weeks. The results of the posttesting revealed that the basal reader approach developed the highest achievement in reading skills. In addition, from this study and previous experience, it appeared that the Teaching English As a Second Language approach could be recommended for the development of oral English skills, and modified language-experience approach could be recommended for the development of writing skills. Report. Division of Research and Development.	E	NA	NA	
	EVALUATION OF ETV				
Delaware	Degree candidates evaluated the closed-ciruit education television network in Delaware. Report. Wilmer E. Wise, Director, Division of Research, Planning and Evaluation.	E	Oct. 1969-Dec. 1969	12,000	

STATE	PROJECT	TYPE	DURATION	COST($)	OUTSIDE CONTRACTOR
	COMPUTER-ASSISTED INSTRUCTION IN MATHEMATICS				
Maryland	The study compared, in terms of achievement test scores, the teaching of the same mathematics course with and without the use of a computer. Seventh grade students in local school districts in Western Maryland were randomly assigned to experimental and control groups of approximately the same size. The groups differed in no systematic way except that one used the computer. In each school, the same teacher, who had been trained in the use of the computer for instruction, taught both experimental and control groups, and programs were balanced to avoid any unequal effect of scheduling on the groups. Pretests and posttests were given to each group. In addition, reactions to the computer-assisted instruction were gathered by opinionnaire from students, teachers, and school administrators. No Report. William Hess, Supervisor of Finance and Data Processing.	E	1969-May 1970	25,000	

STATE	PROJECT	TYPE	DURATION	COST ($)	OUTSIDE CONTRACTOR
	A RESEARCH APPROACH TO DESCRIBING A MODEL MIDDLE SCHOOL IN ACTION AND EVALUATING ITS ACHIEVEMENT				
Maryland	In order to describe a model middle school and evaluate its achievement, the following data were collected from a middle school in Montgomery County: the process of educational effort in action, recorded by trained observers using an observation instrument; sociological changes brought about by the school's combination of grades 5, 6, 7, and 8 and by other innovations; changes in the decision-making process of the school; students' academic achievement; impact of the learning process on students' attitudes, feelings, and percepts; perceptions of the parents, teachers, and administrators regarding the school's avowed goals and their reactions to the school's programs. Similar data were collected from other schools for comparative purposes. No Report.	E	Feb. 1968-70	20,000	Samuel M. Goodman, Director of Research, Montgomery County Public Schools

STATE	PROJECT	TYPE	DURATION	COST ($)	OUTSIDE CONTRACTOR
Maryland	TYPING AS A MOTIVATIONAL FACTOR AND AN INSTRUCTIONAL PROCESS FOR UNDER-EDUCATED ADULTS The lack of enrollment and continued attendance of adults in several centers for Adult Basic Education in the Tri-County region of Western Appalachian Maryland prompted local and state staff to change the method of instruction. In three centers selected for experiment, typewriters were incorporated into the instructional program for three months. Three control groups in other centers in the same area were used. Sessions were videotaped to be analyzed according to the Flanders Interaction Scale. Figures on enrollment and attendance and achievement scores of experimental groups and control groups were compared to each other and to previous years' figures for the same center. No Report. Division of Planning, Research and Evaluation.	E	Feb. 1970-March 1970	10,537	Meshach I. Browning

STATE	PROJECT	TYPE	DURATION	COST ($)	OUTSIDE CONTRACTOR
	EVALUATION OF CONTINUOUS LEARNING PROGRAM				
Massachusetts	Test data and cumulative grade point averages were used to compare the math and verbal achievement of 9th grade students at Meadowbrook Junior High with those of students from Bigelow, Day, Warren, and Weeks. The achievement of 10th, 11th, and 12th grade students at Newton South High School who had been involved in the "continuous education" and traditional programs at Meadowbrook was compared with that of students coming from Warren and Weeks. Report. James F. Baker, Assistant Commissioner, Division of Research and Development. John J. O'Neill, Associate Commissioner, Division of Curriculum and Instruction.	E	1968	NA	
	STATE-WIDE TESTING PROGRAM				
New Hampshire	As part of an on-going evaluation of Title I program, all New Hampshire students in grades 2, 3, 4, 6, and 8 were tested in the fall. In the spring tests were given to a state-wide random sample to determine normal growth expectancies. To these norms were compared the spring test scores of Title I students in grades 2, 4, 6, and 8. No Report. William C. Sterling, Director-Coordinator, Title I, ESEA.	E	Sept. 1969-70	160,000	

STATE	PROJECT	TYPE	DURATION	COST ($)	OUTSIDE CONTRACTOR
New York	AN EVALUATION STUDY OF PREKINDERGARTEN PROGRAMS FOR EDUCATIONALLY DISADVANTAGED CHILDREN This study evaluated the effects of different pre-kindergarten programs for the disadvantaged on capacity to learn, language development, self-concept, physical development and subsequent performmance on readiness and achievement tests. The study included 1800 subjects, experimental and control, in eight school districts. Programs were operated in three successive years with followups into second and first grades and kindergarten. Report. Dr. Louis T. DiLorenzo, Director, Research Training Program.	E	July 1964-June 1969	1.3 mil.	

STATE	PROJECT	TYPE	DURATION	COST ($)	OUTSIDE CONTRACTOR
	FACTORS AFFECTING LEARNING TO READ				
Pennsylvania	In 20 beginning reading classes of grades 1-3, the following four commercially-published methods of teaching reading were compared: the "look-say" whole word approach with a carefully controlled, limited vocabulary; the "look-say" approach plus phonic and word power workbooks; the initial teaching alphabet which attempts to overcome the phonic and spelling inconsistencies of the English language; and phonic, filmstrip approach with a much larger vocabulary than is usual in the first grade. Results indicated that, with properly prepared teachers, intensive phonic methods and materials introducing many different words can make a significant difference in pupil achievement in reading and spelling, according to certain standardized test results. Report. Robert B. Hayes, Director, Bureau of Research.	E	1964-68	115,000	
	THREE FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHING STRATEGIES USING LANGUAGE LABORATORY SYSTEMS				
Pennsylvania	In 60 French and 40 German classes, three different teaching strategies and three different kinds of equipment were tested. The results, verified by repetition of the original study, indicated that many secondary teachers used a multi-station laboratory ineffectively and that maintenance of laboratories was inadequate. The audio-lingual approach was therefore found to be of questionable effectiveness. Report. Emanuel Berger and Philip Smith, Bureau of Research	E	1965-69	295,144	

STATE	PROJECT	TYPE	DURATION	COST($)	OUTSIDE CONTRACTOR
	EVALUATION OF ESEA TITLE I PROGRAMS				
Rhode Island	This on-going activity collected information on 52 per cent of the children enrolled in Title I reading programs in Rhode Island. Data for each child included the child's previous educational history, his current problems, his family's socio-economic background, the characteristics of the program in which he was enrolled, and his scores on achievement tests administered before and after his compensatory program. The evidence has indicated that for a reading program to be most effective it should: be staffed by teachers holding M.A. degrees in reading, irrespective of teaching experience; provide auxiliary services only to those few pupils who absolutely require them; and, maintain identical goals for all the children enrolled. Report. Edward T. Costa, Coordinator for Compensatory Education, State Office of Compensatory Education.	E	Jan. 1967-70	45,000	
	DRIVER EDUCATION AND DRIVER TRAINING CENTER				
Texas	The project organized, operated, and evaluated two basic driver education and driver training programs, one of which used simulators and simulation techniques. No Report.	E	March 1969-70	78,117	Donald A. Board, Houston Independent School District, 1300 Capitol, Houston, Texas

STATE	PROJECT	TYPE	DURATION	COST ($)	OUTSIDE CONTRACTOR
	FOLLOW-UP OF ADULT BASIC EDUCATION				
Texas	The purpose of this project was to determine the effect of adult basic education on the children of adults in the program. A group of first grade students whose parents participated in the adult basic education program was the experimental group, and the control group was first grade students whose parents did not participate in the program. The study compared the scholastic attendance and the scholastic achievement of the two groups. Results showed the experimental group had a higher attendance rate and higher average achievement test score than the control group. Report. Research Coordinating Unit.	E	May 1967-Aug. 1968	14,180	Arturo McDonald, Brownsville Independent School District, Brownsville, Texas
	USING FOREIGN LANGUAGES TO TEACH ACADEMIC SUBJECTS				
Virginia	Statistical data from standardized tests were given to carefully designed pilot classes and control groups were analyzed by a multiple linear regression technique. Opinions and evaluations were gathered from consulants, teachers, and students. Grades were gathered and analyzed. All the evidence showed that advanced students could apply language skills gained over a minimum of three years of study to a practical purpose such as the study of an academic subject. An additional conclusion resulting from the project was that students studying history in a foreign language learned approximately the same amount of language through usage as those studying languages and literature as separate courses. Report. Helen P. Warriner, Supervisor of Foreign Languages, Division of Educational Research and Statistics.	E	1965-Sept. 1968	30,000	

STATE	PROJECT	TYPE	DURATION	COST ($)	OUTSIDE CONTRACTOR
Washington	STUDY OF DRIVER AND TRAFFIC SAFETY EDUCATION This study was designed to compare the relative effectiveness of four selected driver and traffic safety education laboratory programs and three classroom programs. Sophmore students in Washington's largest high school who participated were divided into four groups for the laborator program and three groups for classroom. Pre- and post-tests were given to determine the effectiveness of each program. The results should assist schools in determining the quality of driver and traffic safety education programs. Report. Charles E. McDaniel, Research Office.	E	1967-69	151,000	

STATE	PROJECT	TYPE	DURATION	COST ($)	OUTSIDE CONTRACTOR
	B. VOCATIONAL EDUCATION				
	1. Research a. Needs Assessment and Status Studies to Guide Statewide Planning				
	APPLICANT CHARACTERISTICS BANK				
Alaska	Sponsored and financed jointly by the Departments of Education and Labor, this on-going project was begun to determine the need for vocational education. An attempt was made to locate and develop profiles on every person of working age in rural communities. This information is stored in a computerized data bank where it is available for instant retrieval. In this way, qualified workers can be directed to available local employment. Report. Keith J. Anderson, Coordinator, Office of Planning and Research. John Post, Department of Labor.	R	1969-	255,000	

STATE	PROJECT	TYPE	DURATION	COST ($)	OUTSIDE CONTRACTOR
	VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION-STATEWIDE PLANNING PROJECT				
Alaska	Authorized by 1965 amendments to the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, this two-year planning project sought to develop priorities for improving vocational rehabilitation services. One aspect of the survey involved interviews with 50% of imprisoned Alaskans. The state plan was drawn up on the basis of interview results and recommendations by regional planning groups. Report. Keith J. Anderson, Coordinator, Office of Planning and Research.	R	1967-69	150,000	
	VOCATIONAL AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION MASTER PLAN				
Kentucky	This study proposed to do the following: provide information on existing programs of vocational education; identify general needs for vocational education, and specific needs for vocational training for industry; develop an information system to provide data necessary to shape the direction of future programs; and, produce a master plan for vocational education in Kentucky. No Report. Clayton P. Omvig, Director, Research Coordinating Unit.	R	1970-71	50,000	

STATE	PROJECT	TYPE	DURATION	COST ($)	OUTSIDE CONTRACTOR
	PROJECT HELP				
Minnesota	The purpose of this study was to gather information on needs going unmet by Minnesota's social service agencies. This information will assist the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation in long range planning and the legislature in planning social services. Letters received in response to the National Advertising Council's campaign, "Help for the Disabled", were analyzed to determine respondents' characteristics and needs. The Vocational Rehabilitation casefiles of those respondents were analyzed, and the respondents themselves interviewed. No Report. Division of Vocational Rehabilitation.	R	June 1970-Oct. 1970	19,000	Norman Silverberg, Director of Research, Kenny Institute
	SELF-APPRAISAL OF VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL EDUCATION BY LOCAL SCHOOL COMMITTEES AND INSTRUCTORS				
Mississippi	This project was an evaluation of Vocational-Technical Education programs in the state by three separate groups: teachers, school administrators, and a validation committee appointed by the State Director of Vocational-Technical Education. All vocational-technical programs in the state were included and all vocational teachers participated. Report. Research Coordinating Unit, sponsored jointly by State Division of Vocational-Technical Education in the SDE, and Social Science Research Center of Mississippi State University.	R	NA	NA	

STATE	PROJECT	TYPE	DURATION	COST ($)	OUTSIDE CONTRACTOR
	ATTITUDES OF INDUSTRY AND SECONDARY-SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS TOWARD VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL EDUCATION				
Wyoming	The study was intended to correct the situation that industry cannot find locally qualified help while young people cannot find good jobs. An opinionnaire, offering 25 statements about vocational-technical education, was sent to 190 industrial leaders and all state secondary school administrators. Results enabled the study team to locate the problems and submit recommendations for legislative action. Report.	R	NA	NA	Don Nagel, (Degree Candidate), Adult Education and the Graduate School, University of Wyoming
	COORDINATING VOCATIONAL EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS WITH INDUSTRIAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES				
Wyoming	Questionnaires were sent to 72 of the largest industrial employers in Wyoming to obtain their opinions of vocational education programs. The variety and extent of non-agricultural job placement was determined by examining statistical reviews of the Employment Security Commission. Investigators found that while the number of classes and the enrollment in industrial arts, trades, and industry programs was increasing, job placements were declining, since vocational education programs were not geared to the specific needs of local industry. Report. Robert D. Wright, Research Coordinating Unit, Division of Research and Development.	R	1968	NA	

STATE	PROJECT	TYPE	DURATION	COST ($)	OUTSIDE CONTRACTOR
	OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION NEEDS				
Wyoming	Conducted in the Rock Springs and Green River area, the project surveyed the attitudes and plans of business industry students in grades nine to twelve. The data were studied for their implications for vocational-technical education. Report. Bruce C. Perryman, Director, Research Coordinating Unit. 1. Research b. Needs Assessment and Status Studies to Guide Development of Specific Courses	R	Jan. 1969-Feb. 1969	2,500	
	IMPLICATIONS FOR BUSINESS EDUCATION CURRICULUM OF THE CHANGE OF OFFICE EQUIPMENT USED BY CONNECTICUT BUSINESSES				
Connecticut	The purpose of the report was to determine the type of office machines now being used in selected businesses in the state and to gather data useful for curriculum revision for business education departments in public schools. Data was collected by questionnaires from 3,168 businesses of various kinds. Results pointed to the need for new equipment, curriculum and training programs in business education. NA. Research Coordinating Unit, Division of Vocational Education.	R	NA	NA	Cletus Crow, Associate Professor of Business Education, Central Connecticut State College

STATE	PROJECT	TYPE	DURATION	COST ($)	OUTSIDE CONTRACTOR
	A GUIDE FOR CURRICULUM EXPERIMENTATION IN FOOD HANDLING AND DISTRIBUTION				
Connecticut	The study determined the need for both pre-employment and in-service vocational programs, the level and type of teacher training necessary, and new instructional programs required for vocations in food handling and distribution. Data was gathered through interviews with food store managers and employees. NA. Research Coordinating Unit, Division of Vocational Education.	R	NA	NA	Philip N. Stiles and W. Howard Martin, University of Connecticut
	NURSING RESOURCES AND NURSING EDUCATION				
Florida	Data were gathered by questionnaire from a stratified random sampling of 1,921 licensed nurses, registered and practical, active and inactive. Analysis of the computerized results provided a profile of nurses in Florida, a determination of nursing resources in terms of number, characteristics, and location, a projection of present and future needs for nurses, and recommendations for the improvement of nursing education. Report. Division of Vocational, Technical and Adult Education.	R	1968-69	3,100	Marshall W. McLeod, College of Education, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida

STATE	PROJECT	TYPE	DURATION	COST ($)	OUTSIDE CONTRACTOR
	EDUCATION NEEDS OF SMALL BUSINESS OPERATORS				
Florida	A survey of small businessmen in the Tampa Bay Area indicated the courses most desired by those in retail and service fields. Having determined the previous management experience of the subjects and the sources of management help they utilized, investigators identified particular problem areas and training needs to guide the Center of Continuing Education in planning its programs. Report. Division of Vocational, Technical, and Adult Education.	R	1966-67	4,603	Merle T. Dimbath and James S. Pope, College of Education, University of South Flor
	OCCUPATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES IN HOME ECONOMICS				
Florida	Phase I of the study was a statewide survey of 483 business firms and 315 homemakers representing approximately ten percent of the present and potential employers in home economics and home service fields, exclusive of hotels and restaurants. The survey was designed to identify job characteristics and competencies desired of prospective employees. Phase II and III involved the development and field testing of curriculum guides. Report. Division of Vocational, Technical, and Adult Education.	R	1966-69	72,988	Agnes T. Ridley, Professor of Home Economics Education, Florida State University

STATE	PROJECT	TYPE	DURATION	COST ($)	OUTSIDE CONTRACTOR
Kentucky	JOB-ENTRY REQUIREMENTS FOR AUTO-BODY REPAIR AS PERCEIVED BY EMPLOYERS AND EDUCATORS Rather than evaluating the effectiveness of a vocational education program by examining course content, methods, equipment, or student and teacher characteristics, this project sought to examine the underlying assumption of programs in vocational education, i.e., training validity. To do this the project sought, in the area of auto-body repair, to determine the correlation between entry-level requirements as perceived by employers and terminal training-level requirements as perceived by vocational teachers. No Report. Steven J. Gyuro and Arsenio Espinoza, Research Associates, Research Coordinating Unit.	R	June 1970-Sept. 1970	325	

STATE	PROJECT	TYPE	DURATION	COST ($)	OUTSIDE CONTRACTOR
	ANALYSIS OF ELECTRONIC PROGRAMS IN TECHNICAL INSTITUTES AND REQUIREMENTS FOR ELECTRONIC TECHNOLOGY IN INDUSTRY				
Mississippi	This study, conducted in six southern states, examined industrial needs in the field of electronics and the offerings in this field at public post-high school technical institutes. Findings indicated that electronics teachers place more emphasis on basic electronic content than industrial personnel felt necessary. It was concluded that a standarized program of 1-3 years of technical training would reduce drop-out rate, encourage more students to enter the field and better meet demands of industry. NA. Division of Vocational-Technical Education in SDE.	R	June 1967	9,500	Social Science Research Center of Mississippi State University

STATE	PROJECT	TYPE	DURATION	COST ($)	OUTSIDE CONTRACTOR
Mississippi	EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES AND COMPETENCY NEEDS IN NONFARM AGRICULTURAL OCCUPATIONS This study was designed to identify agricultural employment opportunities and necessary skills for entry into non-farm agricultural occupations. Findings were gathered from 297 interviews with owners or managers of various non-farm businesses serving agricultural industry in the state. One of the major findings was that entry level skills varied for each job, but in all jobs, skills necessary for advancement demanded some knowledge of human relations work. Report. Research Coordinating Unit sponsored jointly by State Division of Vocational-Technical Education in the SDE, and Social Science Research Center of Mississippi State University.	R	NA	NA	

STATE	PROJECT	TYPE	DURATION	COST ($)	OUTSIDE CONTRACTOR
	GEOGRAPHIC AND OCCUPATIONAL MOBILITY AMONG ELECTRONIC TECHNICIANS				
New Jersey	The project studied mobility among electronic technicians to define what this mobility means for an electronics curriculum. The study determined geographic and occupational mobility patterns of electronic technicians in New Jersey, New York and Pennsylvania and compared those patterns to mobility patterns to mobility patterns of other technicians. The study then analyzed whether an electronic technician needed new skills and knowledge when he moved or changed jobs. Finally, the study determined to what extent mobility differed according to whether the training in electronics had been received in high school, post-high school, or on-the-job. No Report. Bureau of Occupational Research Development.	R	Oct. 1969-Sept. 1970	2,082	Charles H. Buzzell, Coordinator, Leadership Training Institute
	REQUIREMENTS FOR EMPLOYMENT IN TWO OFF-FARM AGRICULTURAL OCCUPATIONS				
Texas	This project attempted to identify the level of knowledge and skills to become an entry-level worker in the occupations of farm machinery service and repair, and ornamental horticulture. Five reports describing various aspects of the project were disseminated. Report. Occupational Research Coordinating Unit.	R	1968-69	24,871	Earl Webb, Texas A & M University, College Station, Texas

STATE	PROJECT	TYPE	DURATION	COST ($)	OUTSIDE CONTRACTOR
	AUTOMOTIVE MECHANICS PROGRAMS				
Texas	The project surveyed and evaluated the facilities, equipment, and curricular requirements for automotive mechanics programs at the post-secondary level in Texas. A major objective was to produce comprehensive guidelines for development by Texas Education Agency of improved training programs in this occupation. No Report. Occupational Research Coordinating Unit.	R	July 1969-Dec. 1970	7,136	Bernard T. McLennand, Central Texas College, Killeen, Texas
	1. Research c. Personnel Training and Performance				
Florida	PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCIES OF TECHNICAL EDUCATION TEACHERS A basic comprehensive examination, a sociometric rating of professional colleagues, and an index of cooperation were used as measures of competence for 106 teachers, representing the entire population of technical education teachers as defined for the study. Investigators sought to determine whether professional competency was a funtion of specified educational background variables. Report. Division of Vocational, Technical and Adult Education.	R	1966-67	3,784	Edwin L. Kurth and Paul C. Gianini, Jr., College of Education, University of Florida

STATE	PROJECT	TYPE	DURATION	COST ($)	OUTSIDE CONTRACTOR
	EFFECTIVENESS OF COUNSELORS IN CCOPERATIVE SCHOOL PROGRAMS				
Minnesota	In order to evaluate the effectiveness of counselors, the project analyzed caseload information from data files to determine the information's reliability. The Master's Degree candidate who performed the study used a multiple correlation and step-wise regression analysis. The study also developed a system to evaluate counselors' performance on the basis of the difficulty of individual cases and the counselors' total caseloads, thus giving credit for quality as well as quantity. No Report. Duane T. Sermon, Rehabilitation Specialist for Research, Division of Vocational Rehabilitation.	R	July 1969-Dec. 1970	4,500	
	1. Research d. Predicting Course Success				
	INDICATORS OF SUCCESS IN SELECTED TRADE AND IN-INDUSTRIAL PROGRAMS				
Kentucky	A sample of 75 students enrolled in the Nelson County Extension Center, Bardstown, Kentucky, was administered a variety of tests. After a multiple-regression analysis, the project determined what criteria could be used to predict success in auto-mechanics and in mechanical drafting. No Report. Steven Gyuro and Charles Aebersold, Research Coordinating Unit.	R	Feb. 1970-Nov, 1970	400	

STATE	PROJECT	TYPE	DURATION	COST ($)	OUTSIDE CONTRACTOR
	1. Research e. Cost Effectiveness of Programs				
Florida	COST-EFFECTIVENESS ANALYSIS OF VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS The study examined the public and private costs and utility aspects of selected vocational-technical education programs offered by two area vocational-technical schools. Formulae were developed to guide administrators in allocation of staff, facilities, finances and other resources, and a cost-utility model was proposed as a tool for designing and implementing a planning, programming, budgeting system (PPBS). The highly favorable cost-utility ratios calculated for both public and private sectors, particularly in "specialized programs," led to the conclusion that expansion of training in vocational-technical schools should be given high priority. Report. Division of Vocational, Technical and Adult Education.	R	1968-69	13,708	Richard H.P. Craft, Associate Professor, Florida State University

STATE	PROJECT	TYPE	DURATION	COST ($)	OUTSIDE CONTRACTOR
Wyoming	COST-BENEFIT ANALYSIS OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION In a doctoral dissertation for the University of Wyoming, the cost of the vocational education programs in six secondary schools was compared with the cost of the academic programs in those six schools. The benefits received in five years by the 1965 graduates of the voational education programs in those schools were then compared with the benefits received in five years by the 1965 graduates of the academic programs in the schools. Cost-benefit analyses were performed on both programs and the results were compared. No Report. Fred P. Black, Jr., Research Associate, Research Coordinating Unit.	R	1970	NA	

STATE	PROJECT	TYPE	DURATION	COST($)	OUTSIDE CONTRACTOR
	1. Research f. Follow-up Studies				
	REASONS FOR PRACTICAL NURSING STUDENTS DISCONTINUING THEIR TRAINING AT THE LARAMIE MDTA VOCATIONAL SCHOOL OF PRACTICAL NURSING				
Wyoming	The study was designed to determine factors common to all dropouts and recommend ways of lowering the dropout rate. Procedures include: studying cumulative records of graduates and dropouts; contacting and questioning dropouts; and, sending a questionnaire to graduates. The questionnaires and student file information were summarized and statistically treated to find the significant differences between graduates and dropouts. Report. Research Coordinating Unit, Section of Research and Development.	R	NA	NA	Robert Roree, Graduate RCU Research Assistant, University of Wyoming
	2. Development				
	CAREER INFORMATION: THE VIEW SYSTEM				
California	This project developed and demonstrated a career information system for secondary schools in San Diego County. The initial phase was a needs assessment performed through student reactor panels, advisory committees, and questionnaires. The second phase was the development of the system which is based on microfilm aperture cards. Report.	Dv Dm	1967-69	123,218	Edwin A. Whitfield, Guidance Coordinator, San Diego County Department of Education

STATE	PROJECT	TYPE	DURATION	COST($)	OUTSIDE CONTRACTOR
	CAREER SELECTION EDUCATION				
Utah	This project was designed to develop adequate vocational education for small, rural high schools. In the sophmore year, students in project schools made a tentative career choice after a course in "Career Selection and Orientation to the Work World", and in junior and senior years students whose career choice involved non-baccalaureate education received training in their chosen occupation. The project featured use of self instructional material, use of community resources, integration with present school courses, and creation of a new faculty position, Career Selection Agent, to coordinate the program. Report. Russell G. Merrell Director, Western States Small Schools District.	Dv	1965-68	153,500	

STATE	PROJECT	TYPE	DURATION	COST ($)	OUTSIDE CONTRACTOR
West Virginia	RESEARCH COORDINATING UNIT FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION The unit was established to perform the following functions: assist in the stimulation and development of occupational research activities; coordinate occupational education research activities within the State with those outside the State; disseminate information pertaining to the progress and application of findings of occupational education research; plan and develop specific research and training programs related to occupational research; develop projects supported by public or private funds; and, manage special projects funded under the provisions of Parts C and D of the 1968 Vocational Act Amendments. Report for May, 1967 - August, 1969. Bureau of Vocational, Technical and Adult Education.	Dv	May 1967-	246,000 (first 4 years)	Glenn Smith, Research Coordinating Unit, Marshall University, Huntington, West Va.

STATE	PROJECT	TYPE	DURATION	COST ($)	OUTSIDE CONTRACTOR
	3. Disseminations a. Systems				
	VOCATIONAL RESEARCH INFORMATION CENTERS				
Florida	The purpose of the project was to establish, with the help of consultants and local educational personnel, research information centers in approximately sixty educational institutions throughout Florida. The centers will form a link between the Department of Education's Vocational Education Research Information and the ERIC system. Sixteen centers have been established and eighteen are proposed for 1970-71. The remaining centers will be completed in 1971-72. No Report. K.M. Eaddy, Division of Vocational, Technical, and Adult Education.	Ds	1969-70	7,684	

STATE	PROJECT	TYPE	DURATION	COST ($)	OUTSIDE CONTRACTOR
	3. Dissemination b. Publications				
New York	ENTRY REQUIREMENTS FOR REGISTERED APPRENTICE TRAINING This report is a compilation of entry requirements into the registered apprenticeship programs as established by program sponsor in compliance with the regulations set by the Commissioner of Industrial Relations. The two objectives of the report are: to provide a current statewide summary of minimum qualifications and selection standards to program administrators for use in evaluation and policy making; and to provide local people who might encourage young people to enter apprenticeship programs with a general understanding of the recruitment procedures and entry requirements. Report. Louis Cohen, Chief, Bureau of Occupational Education Research. Elbert Gardner, Chief, Bureau of Manpower, Department of Labor.	Ds	NA	NA	

STATE	PROJECT	TYPE	DURATION	COST($)	OUTSIDE CONTRACTOR
	IMPLICATIONS OF RESEARCH FOR INDUSTRIAL TEACHERS				
Florida	The purpose of the project was to identify recent research in trades and in industrial education and to draw implications from this research in a form usable by vocational teachers. No Report. Division of Vocational, Technical, and Adult Education.	Ds	July 1970-71	5,800	R.O. Gallington, Director, Vocational Education Department, Florida State Universit
	SELECTED REPORTS FROM A SEMINAR ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATION				
Wyoming	From the proceedings of a three-week research seminar on vocational education held at the University of Wyoming several reports on techniques, results, and areas of research were selected for dissemination. Report. Fred P. Black, Jr., Research Associate, Research Coordinating Unit.	Ds	July 1968	1,000	
	SYNTHESIS OF FOLLOW-UP STUDIES OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION				
Wyoming	A degree candidate collected over three hundred follow-up studies of vocational education, analyzed the procedures and aims of these studies, evaluated them according to nationwide standards for follow-up studies, and produced an annotated bibliography. No Report. Fred P. Black, Jr., Research Associate, Research Coordinating Unit.	Ds	Aug. 1968-June 1969	3,000	

STATE	PROJECT	TYPE	DURATION	COST ($)	OUTSIDE CONTRACTOR
	4. Evaluation a. Specific Programs				
Connecticut	AN EXPERIMENTAL STUDY TO EVALUATE THE INTRODUCTION OF A VOCATIONALLY ORIENTED PROGRAM IN JUNIOR HIGH The purpose of the study was to experiment with and evaluate the introduction of a vocational-oriented program in junior high. Students participating were selected by teacher records, report cards, attendance records and achievement scores. Report showed that positive change occurred in attitude and interest toward school when the classroom work was correlated with shop duties. Report. Research Coordinating Unit, Division of Vocational Education.	E	NA	NA	Yale

STATE	PROJECT	TYPE	DURATION	COST ($)	OUTSIDE CONTRACTOR
	CHANGES OF ATTITUDES AMONG DISADVANTAGED JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS				
Florida	Eighteen culturally disadvantaged 8th and 9th grade boys, identified as underachievers and potential dropouts, were enrolled in an experimental program of occupational exploration, remedial work in mathematics and communication skills, and individualized attention to special physical, mental, and emotional needs. Tests to measure changes in attitudes, self-concept, educational and occupational aspirations, and intelligence were given before and after the course to the experimental group and to a matching control group. Analysis of the results led to the conclusion that such a program may encourage the student to remain in school, make use of his potential abilities, make a choice of career, and understand the interrelationship of his own attitudes toward school, employment, and himself. Report. Division of Vocational, Technical, and Adult Education.	E	1968-69	9,497	Rose Bud McClosey, Director of Vocational Education, Richardson High School, Lake City, Columbia County, Florida

STATE	PROJECT	TYPE	DURATION	COST($)	OUTSIDE CONTRACTOR
	FOLLOW-UP ON APPLICANTS FOR VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION SERVICES				
Maryland	To evaluate the effectiveness of the Maryland program of vocational rehabilitation, an intensive study was made of 1,700 people who had applied for vocational rehabilitation services during the three-month period January through March, 1964. The study attempted to find out what happened to the people three years later, and to find out how they had or had not profited from services offered by the agency. Report. Richard Helfrich, Divisional of Vocational Rehabilitation.	E	March 1967-Sept. 1968	66,792	
	ATTITUDES OF JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL STAFF MEMBERS TOWARD VOCATIONAL EDUCATION				
Massachusetts	One regional vocational-technical high school and three junior high schools were studied. Three half-day workshops incorporating various attitude change treatments were conducted by the staff of the vocational school for each of the experimental high schools. Attitudes of junior high school staff members toward vocational education and self-concepts of vocational staff members were measured before and after the workshop. Report. William G. Conroy, Research Coordinating Unit.	E	1969	NA	

STATE	PROJECT	TYPE	DURATION	COST ($)	OUTSIDE CONTRACTOR
	TESTING A MODEL FOR EVALUATION OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PILOT PROGRAMS				
New Jersey	The study evaluated the effectiveness of pilot Commercial Food Service programs graduating their first class in June 1969. The effectiveness of the pilot programs was compared to that of regular programs preparing Commerical Food Service workers in vocational high schools. The evaluation used a behavior model that had been derived from reference groups, and the study tested this model at the same time it evaluated the programs. Report. Walter E. Brown, Bureau of Occupational Research Development, Division of Vocational Education.	E	Jan.-June 1969	450	

STATE	PROJECT	TYPE	DURATION	COST ($)	OUTSIDE CONTRACTOR
New Jersey	VALUE OF EXPOSURE OF PRACTICAL NURSING STUDENTS TO HEALTH AGENCIES DURING PRE-CLINICAL TRAINING The degree candidate performing the study found that practical nursing students who had had planned experiences caring for patients during their pre-clinical education received significantly higher ratings in the performance of skills than did students who had not had those experiences in a hospital setting. No statistically significant difference was found between the knowledge acquired by those who had had experiences with patients and those who had not had such experiences. Report. Joan Birchenall, Bureau of Occupational Research Development, Division of Vocational Education.	E	June-Sept. 1970	880	
New Jersey	VOCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT OF NINTH GRADE STUDENTS IN SELECTED SCHOOL DISTRICTS A degree candidate studied 9th grade students in the Introduction to Vocations Program to determine their occupational knowledge, vocational attitudes, and their knowledge and understanding of guidance concepts. In addition, a follow-up study of the graduated of the original Introduction to Vocations Program was conducted to determine their opinions of the program and their satisfaction with their jobs. No Report. Donald J. Tosh, Bureau of Occupational Research Development, Division of Vocational Education.	E	Jan.-June 1970	1,894	

STATE	PROJECT	TYPE	DURATION	COST ($)	OUTSIDE CONTRACTOR
	FOLLOW-UP STUDY OF BOOKKEEPING STUDENTS				
New York	Students who completed New York State Syllabus-Outlined Courses in Bookkeeping I and II in 1960-61 were studied to determine the relationship between knowledge and skills contained in the syllabi and those needed for post-graduate studies. NA.	E	NA	19,015	NA
	EVALUATION OF HALF-DAY PROGRAM AT THE FORMAN AREA EDUCATIONAL CENTER				
New York	The preliminary phase of a two and one-half year evaluation cycle following a model developed for personnel of occupational education centers suggested that the half-day program was not achieving the objectives set for it. No Report. Bureau of Occupational Research.	E	1968-69	10,000	Russell F. Green, Monroe County BOCES #1
	EVALUATION OF OCCUPATIONAL EXPLORATORY PROGRAMS IN THE MIDDLE GRADES				
North Carolina	Pilot projects of occupational exploration in the middle grades were evaluated in terms of students' attitudes toward vocations, school, and the projects themselves. Factors influencing the effectiveness of instruction were examined. No Report. W.J. Brown, Jr., Director, Division of Research.	E	1970	18,000	

STATE	PROJECT	TYPE	DURATION	COST ($)	OUTSIDE CONTRACTOR
	CAREER OPPORTUNITIES				
Washington	A selected group of 9th grade general mathematics students at South Mercer Junior High researched and produced a series of video tapes on vocations and job opportunities available upon completion of a two-year community college program. The Kuder Preference Record Test was administered before and after the project to evaluate the effect on student attitudes toward vocational roles. Parent attitudes toward the project were also surveyed. Report. Research Coordinating Unit for Vocational Education	E	1969	7,191	Lee Lowe Director of Research and Information, Mercer Island School District, No. 400 Robert Barton Principal, South Mercer Junior High
	CHANGES OF ATTITUDE AFTER A WORKSHOP ON VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL EDUCATION				
Wyoming	Participants in a three-week workshop on vocational and technical education were given attitude tests before and after the workshop. The subsequent report, available from ERIC, indicated that small but significant changes of attitude had resulted. Report. Fred P. Black, Jr., Research Associate, Research Coordinating Unit.	E	July 1968	500	

STATE	PROJECT	TYPE	DURATION	COST ($)	OUTSIDE CONTRACTOR
	4. Evaluation b. Procedures SYSTEM FOR BIENNIAL REVIEW OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION THRID PARTY PROGRAMS				
North Carolina	This project was designed to develop an effective method for review of third party Vocational Rehabilitation programs. The first part was a review of previous methods of evaluation used and an identification of all third party agreements in the state. Other project elements included: devising a form, a questionnaire and summary for reporting review findings, recommending a way to designate review teams; running pilot trials; scheduling a biennial and systematic review and report; orienting personnel to the system of review; and, maintaining and disseminating records of all reports. No Report. Jean E. Kirkman, Program Development and Planning Section, Division of Vocational Rehabilitation.	E	Aug. 1968-70	NA	

STATE	PROJECT	TYPE	DURATION	COST ($)	OUTSIDE CONTRACTOR
	C. SPECIAL EDUCATION				
	1. Research a. Needs Assessment and Status Studies				
Wyoming	OCCUPATIONAL NEEDS OF THE SOCIO-ECONOMIC, DISADVANTAGED, AND OTHER HANDICAPPED YOUTH OF LARAMIE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT NUMBER ONE An investigating committee identified ways of meeting occupational needs of disadvantaged youth. Assessment, based on the number of children needing services, number and nature of suitable jobs, and current school programs and provisions, was carried out by the following procedures: determining potential student dropouts from 10 selected factors related to unsuccessful school performance; surveying businesses for available jobs and preparing job analyses; and, visiting classes, touring facilities, and interviewing school personnel. Data from the findings are to be used for the establishment of an area vocational school. Report. Wilma E. Hirst, Research Coordinating Unit, Research and Development Section.	R	NA	NA	

STATE	PROJECT	TYPE	DURATION	COST ($)	OUTSIDE CONTRACTOR
	1. Research b. Curriculum and Instruction INTERVENTION FOR EDUCABLE MENTALLY RETARDED CHILDREN				
Florida	Investigators tested two hypotheses: that intervention of clinical educators could enable randomly selected children, classified as "educable mentally retarded", to be returned to regular classes with the expectation of success in that setting; and that existing instruments and procedures could differentiate between those students who might successfully be returned and those who might appropriately be placed in a special education class. Report. Bureau of Curriculum and Instruction, Education for Exceptional Child Section.	R	1969-70	50,000	Louis Schwartz Professor of Special Education Florida State University, Talahassee, Florida

STATE	PROJECT	TYPE	DURATION	COST ($)	OUTSIDE CONTRACTOR
	EARLY IDENTIFICATION AND CORRECTION OF LEARNING PROBLEMS IN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CHILDREN				
Florida	The project focused on children in elementary school who develop early patterns of extreme failure and are later placed in special education classes. The purpose was to show that, in many cases, an intensive intervention program, undertaken before massive failure is experienced, could increase the children's success in their regular classroom, making later special education unnecessary. The effectiveness of classrooms with such programs was compared to the effectiveness of classrooms with no intervention programs; the effectiveness of intervention programs in regular classrooms were compared to intervention programs in specially contructed, ten-children classroom settings. The comparisons were repeated with different teachers to assess the importance of the teacher in such an intervention program. Report. Bureau of Curriculum and Instruction.	R	May-Dec. 1969	49,982	James W. Barnard, Institute III: Exceptional Children and Adults, University of South Fla., Tampa, Florida

STATE	PROJECT	TYPE	DURATION	COST ($)	OUTSIDE CONTRACTOR
	PROGRAMS FOR THE NEUROLOGICALLY HANDICAPPED				
Ohio	Three aspects of Ohio's special education programs for the neurologically handicapped were studied and evaluated: early identification of children with learning disabilities and behavior disorders; development of comprehensive programs of instruction and activities for them; and return of the children, after improvement, to their regular class. Report. Division of Special Education.	R	June 1968-70	40,000	Martha Serio
	TRAINING MENTALLY RETARDED GIRLS AS NURSES AIDES				
Texas	The project was designed to determine whether mentally retarded girls could successfully be trained as nurses aides. Fifty-one girls participated in both classroom instruction and supervised training in a cooperating hospital. One-third of the participants successfully completed training after one year and were subsequently employed as nurses aides. Report. Occupational Research Coordinating Unit.	R	Oct. 1966-67	15,425	Robert Rast, St. Phillips College, San Antonio, Texas

STATE	PROJECT	TYPE	DURATION	COST ($)	OUTSIDE CONTRACTOR
	ANALYSIS OF TEACHER-DEFINED PROBLEMS AND STRATEGIES FOR THE EDUCATION OF HANDICAPPED CHILDREN				
Wisconsin	All teachers of Educable Mentally Retarded were asked to define the problems they face in their teaching, indicate the perceived causes of the problems, and state what teaching strategies they use to combat these problems. A random sample of these teachers were then asked to sort and categorize the results, and categories of major problems were established ranked according to frequency. With its emphasis on "teacher-perceived" problems, as opposed to "administrator-defined" ones, the study hopes ro provide more meaningful guidelines for efficient allocation of resources in special education program development. Report. John J. Cook, Coordinator, Research Design and Administration, Division for Handicapped Children.	R	July 1966-March 1967	11,898	

STATE	PROJECT	TYPE	DURATION	COST ($)	OUTSIDE CONTRACTOR
	1. Research c. Personnel Training and Performance CLASS SIZE AND TEACHER AIDES AS FACTORS IN THE ACHIEVEMENT OF THE MENTALLY RETARDED				
Wisconsin	The project provided information for making decisions on proper utilization of special education teachers. An estimate was made of the optimum class size, with and without teacher aides, for maximum linguistic achievement, academic achievement, and social adjustment in primary and intermediate classes of retarded children. Possible modifying factors such as the socio-economic backgrounds of the children, their intellectual levels, and teachers' and aides' values as they effective their work together were also analyzed. Cost-analyses of the teacher aide, increased enrollment plan were compared favorably with costs of traditional plans. Video tapes of teacher aide classrooms were used to show the plan's effectiveness. All the results were to be disseminated if the study suggested a prototype feasible for replication state-wide and nationwide. Report. Kenneth R. Blessing, Director, Bureau of Special Education.	R	June 1966-70	223,035	

STATE	PROJECT	TYPE	DURATION	COST ($)	OUTSIDE CONTRACTOR
	2. Development PREVOCATIONAL WORK EXPERIENCE FOR BLIND STUDENTS				
Texas	The project had five major objectives: to investigate, identify, refine, test, and publish the methods and adaptions which would be necessary in integrating blind and partially-sighted students into existing vocational education programs; to design vocational cooperative education programs specifically for blind and partially-sighted students; to compile a list of occupational areas and employment opportunities in Texas for blind or partially-sighted students; to produce and disseminate a color/sound film to demonstrate this innovative approach to educating the blind; to share the results with other education agencies. The project was a cooperative undertaking of the Department of Occupational Education and Technology, and the Division of Special Education, conducted at the Texas State School for the Blind, Austin, Texas. No Report. Don L. Partridge, Director, Division of Special Education.	Dv	June-Aug. 1969	60,000	

STATE	PROJECT	TYPE	DURATION	COST ($)	OUTSIDE CONTRACTOR
	3. Demonstration				
	SAN ANTONIO BILINGUAL DEMONSTRATION AND DISSEMINATION CENTER				
Texas	The center designs, demonstrates, and evaluates a bilingual program for first and second grades using innovative materials and techniques, including teacher training. Materials to assist children in the learning and reading skills are prepared and demonstrated. The project provides facilities for collecting, screening, and disseminating information about elementary bilingual education programs. No Report.	Dm	March 1969-Feb. 1970	98,400	Harold H. Hitt, Superintendent, San Antonio Independent School District, 141 Lavaca Street, San Antonion, Texas
	DEMONSTRATION LEARNING CENTERS FOR TEACHERS OF CHILDREN WITH LEARNING DISABILITIES				
Texas	This project developed, demonstrated, and provided multi-disciplinary diagnostic techniques for children with specific language and learning disabilities. A prescriptive teaching approach was used with two organizational approaches being tested: placing a small group of the children in an ungraded, self-contained classroom under the leadership of a highly trained teacher assisted by an aid; or leaving the children in their regular classroom for the majority of the day, but scheduling them in groups of three or four, in a "resource room" with a special teacher for daily periods of one hour. 1969-70 was the second year of the project. No Report.	Dm	Sept. 1969-Aug. 1970	75,000	Wesley Martin, Superintendent, Greenville Independent School District, Box 1022, Greenville, Texas

STATE	PROJECT	TYPE	DURATION	COST($)	OUTSIDE CONTRACTOR
	4. Evaluation PROJECT FEEDBACK				
Wisconsin	PROJECT FEEDBACK is a model to provide on-going evaluation of new and existing programs for handicapped children. With the goal of improving instructional services, the feedback model will: articulate instructional and administrative objectives; provide a catalog of tests that index these objectives; provide meaningful statistical information regarding attainment of objectives. Once field-tested, the procedures will be passed on to supervisors in the Division for Handicapped Children for dissemination to local districts and to classroom teachers for their own evaluation purpose No Report. John J ok, Director, Research Design and Adminis. ation, Division for Handicapped Children Services.	E	May 1969-Sept. 1970	66,300	

APPENDIX H

PROJECT LIST

The following are the 107 projects selected for listing out of the 450 submitted. The list is arranged alphabetically by state and project title. The listing provides the following information:

- project title
- a short project description
- the type of project abbreviated as follows:

  R - Research
  Dv - Development
  Dm - Demonstration
  Ds - Dissemination
  E - Evaluation

- the responsible division and/or bureau within the state department
- the responsible state department person and his title
- project dates and cost. Where the cost is not given, the budget was not available.
- name, title and affiliation of the outside contractor, if any
- whether a report is available

ALASKA
State Department of Education
Juneau 99801

DIRECTIONS '70: AN ASSESSMENT OF EDUCATIONAL NEEDS in Alaska evaluating state educational needs on the basis of all 1967-1970 literature available--R Ds; Office of Planning and Research. Norma Bowkett, March-August 1970, $8,000. Report.

CALIFORNIA
State Department of Education
Sacramento 95814

CLASSROOM TEACHER SUPPORT SYSTEM (CTSS) providing computer based support for the classroom teacher in selected subject--Dv; ESEA Title III Center for Planned Change, Edmund B. Adams, 1968-1970 and continuing, $45,500. Report.

FOLLOW THROUGH developing evaluation procedures for the Follow Through program in the state and recommending changes for each program--Dv E; Bureau of Compensatory Education, Jim Jordan, Project Coordinator, Follow Through, September 1969 and continuing. No report.

LANGUAGE DISABILITIES IN YOUNG CHILDREN diagnosing and reducing language deficiencies in children K-3 in Sacramento County--Dv; Educational Resources Agency, 1968-69, $40,000. William Smith, Project Director, Sacramento County Office of Education. Report.

MODEL PROGRAM FOR HANDICAPPED CHILDREN developing and demonstrating a model program of individualized instruction for use in regular classrooms by educationally handicapped children--Dv Dm; Educational Resources Agency, July 1969 and continuing, $43,047. Robert Stannard, District Superintendent, North Sacramento School District. Report.

PROJECT PASS providing a program in communication skills and mathematics to insure employability and develop favorable attitudes toward employment--DV; Educational Resources Agency, June 1968 and continuing $208, 459. William Garrison, District Superintendent, Grant Joint Union High School District. Report.

PROJECT SEMINAR developing, installing, and evaluating self-selected mathematics in-service experiences for K-8 in public and private schools in 13 counties--Dv E; Educational Resources Agency, July 1970 and continuing, $77,142. Robert Wapple, County Superintendent, Yuba County Office of Education. Report.

A REGIONAL APPROACH: ESL/BILINGUAL-BICULTURAL demonstrating instructional programs for non-English speaking students--Dv; 1967-70 $815,856. William H. Stegeman, Assistant Superintedent, Curriculum Services Division, San Diego Unified School District. No report.

SELF-CONCEPT AND COGNITIVE SKILLS DEVELOPMENT PROJECT aiming to show that discovery method of teaching can give culturally disadvantaged students confidence in their own ability--Dv; Educational Resources Agency, August 1967 and continuing, $252,466. William Fowler, District Superintendent, Del Paso Heights School District. Report.

SEMINAR PROGRAM - HIGH SCHOOL GIFTED evaluating the Seminar program for gifted high school students in terms of performance and behavorial objectives--E; 1967-70, $97,242. Richard Barbour, Assistant Superintendent, Student Services Division, San Diego Unified School District. No report.

SENSORY ADJUSTMENT FOR EFFECTIVE READING aiming to increase growth by nine months in reading skills of primary students using Clinical Approach to Eye Screening--Dv; 1970-71, $23,669. Lloyd O'Connell Principal, Ocean Knoll School, Encinitas Union School District. Report.

SERVICES AND PROGRAMS FOR MULTIPLE - HANDICAPPED CHILDREN IN SAN DIEGO COUNTY developing services including development of student information system; and creation of a clearing house and referral center for community resources, and a teaching demonstration center--Dv; 1969-70, $29,975. Glen N. Pierson, Director, Pupil Personnel Service, San Diego County Department of Education. Report.

TRAINING AND PLACEMENT OF THE CULTURALLY DISADVANTAGED preparing disadvantaged youth in the Sacramento area as junior computer operators -- Dv Dm; Educational Resources Agency, July 1969 and continuing, $2,000. Charles W. Farrell, Sacramento Chapter of the Association for Computing Machinery. Report.

FLORIDA
State Department of Education
Tallahassee 32301

CLEARWATER COMPREHENSIVE JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL EVALUATION assessing an innovative approach to occupational exploration programs--E; Division of Vocational, Technical, and Adult Education, 1968-69, $9,999. Joe D. Mills, Executive Assistant Superintendent of Vocational Education, Pinellas County. Report.

CONSUMER EDUCATION TEACHING MATERIALS FOR DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS AND UNDERPRIVILEGED ADULTS--Dv; Division of Vocational, Technical, and Adult Education, 1970-71, $26,290. Agnes F. Ridley, Department of Home Economics Education, School of Home Economics, Florida State University. No report.

EVALUATION OF EXEMPLARY PROGRAMS IN DADE, DUVAL, ESCAMBIA, AND HILLSBOROUGH COUNTIES assessing occupational programs for disadvantaged students--E; Division of Vocational, Technical, and Adult Education, 1970-71, $60,584. Hobdy Perkins, Chairman, Department of Vocational Education, University of West Florida. No report.

EXPERIMENTAL HOME ECONOMICS CURRICULUM PROJECT encouraging critical thinking through problem solving and independent study--Dv; Division of Vocational, Technical, and Adult Education, 1967-70, $24,482. Mary Ray, Supervisor of Secondary Home Economics, Broward County. Report.

THE FUSION OF APPLIED AND INTELLECTUAL SKILLS developing a model curriculum to integrate vocational and academic skills for students K-5--Dv; Division of Vocational, Technical and Adult Education, 1970-71, $66,659. Mrs. M. F. Smith, Project Leader, P. K. Youge Laboratory School, University of Florida. No report.

INDUSTRIAL ARTS CURRICULUM PROJECT offering a pre-career development program for elementary and middle school disadvantaged youth--Dv; Division of Vocational, Technical, and Adult Education, 1970-71, $50,000. Hugh Hinely, Department of Industrial Arts and Vocational Education, College of Education, Florida State University. No report.

INTRODUCTION TO VOCATIONS providing an experimental course to 9th grade pupils with an opportunity to examine a variety of occupations--Dv; Division of Vocational, Technical, and Adult Education, 1968-69, $15,699. Burgess Meadows, Director of Vocational Education, Brevard County Board of Public Instruction. Report.

MODEL FOR EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS SUBMITTED FOR FUNDING UNDER CATEGORICAL AID PROGRAMS--R E; Bureau of Research, Division of Elementary and Secondary Education, James R. Swanson, May-August 1970. No report.

MODEL FOR OCCUPATIONAL INFORMATION IN AGRICULTURE identifying employment opportunities and training needs in farming and off-farm businesses--E; 1970-71. J. W. Hensel, Chairman, Department of Vocational, and Adult Education, College of Education, University of Florida. No report.

MODEL FOR A TOTAL APPROACH TO NON-GRADED VOCATIONAL PROGRAMS IN A SEPARATE EDUCATIONAL CENTER teaching educational and occupational skills to disadvantaged youth in four metropolitan areas--Dm; 1970-72, $964,000. Carl W. Proehl and K. M. Eaddy, Division of Vocational, Technical, and Adult Education; Charles S. Partin, Escambia County Project Director; Ralph Smouse, Hillsborough County Project Director; Ernest Upthegrove, Assistant Director, High School Vocational and Technical Education, Dade County. No report.

PLANNING GRANT TO DETERMINE NEED FOR OCCUPATIONAL EXPLORATION PROGRAMS IN ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS--Dv; July 1970, $5,000. Hugh Hinely, Chairman, Department of Industrial Arts, College of Education, Florida State University. No report.

SCHOOL STAFFING STUDY training school personnel to investigate new performance-based staffing patterns--R Dv Dm Ds; Bureau of Curriculum and Instruction, Division of Elementary and Secondary Education, James A. Moore, Associate, Program Development, 1969-71, $208,000. Report.

STATE-WIDE AUTOMATED INFORMATION RETRIEVAL SYSTEM FOR PHYSICAL FACILITIES providing data for planning school buildings to the Department, the Legislature, and counties--R; Bureau of School Facilities, Division of Elementary and Secondary Education, 1969-71, $29,855. John Love, School Services Specialist. No report.

STATE-WIDE EVALUATION OF VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL EDUCATION coordinating "sub-studies", especially of programs and services for high school and special needs--E; February-December 1970, $50,930. Richard H. P. Kraft, Associate Professor, College of Education, Florida State University. No report.

STUDIES OF STUDENT FINANCIAL AID PROGRAMS, NEEDS, AND RESOURCES forming models for long-range planning--R E; Bureau of Teacher Education, Certification, Accreditation, Division of Elementary and Secondary Education, W. W. Wharton, Director, Scholarships and Loans Section, September 1969-February 1970, $29,300. Report.

SURVEY TO DETERMINE NEEDED OCCUPATIONAL TRAINING OPPORTUNITIES FOR DISADVANTAGED ADULTS resulting in proposed mobile unit for teaching in poverty enclaves--R; 1969-70, $8,149. William D. Ceely, Director of Development and Research, Lake City Junior College and Forest Ranger School. No report.

VITAL INFORMATION FOR EDUCATION AND WORK evaluating the VIEW system of occupational counseling in two school districts--E; 1970-71, $80,517. William L. Kitching, Director, Panhandle Area Educational Cooperation, and Lawrence E. Paige, Director, Vocational-Technical Education, Broward County. No report.

GEORGIA
State Department of Education
Atlanta 30334

COORDINATED VOCATIONAL-ACADEMIC EDUCATION (COOPERATIVE---CVAE--PROGRAM) offering vocational laboratories, work settings, and group guidance for underachieving high school youth--Dv; Leadership services, Division of Vocational Education, 1970 and continuing. Kenneth R. Reynolds, State Supervisor, Work Study and Special Needs Programs. Report.

WHY! CONTEMPORARY AFFAIRS FOR HIGH SCHOOL presently a television series on contemporary affairs using concepts and open-ended questions to develop problem-solving skills in high school students - Dv; Educational Television Services, Robert Hawkins, Project Manager, July 1970 and continuing. No report.

KANSAS
State Department of Public Instruction
Topeka 66612

EVALUATION OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAM--E; Advisory Council for Vocational Education in Kansas, February-October 1970, $11,850. Allen Lee, Teaching Research Division, Oregon System of Higher Education. No report.

TITLE IV SECTION 402 PROJECT Restructuring state department research to serve institutional decision-making-- R Dv Dm Ds E; May 1970-June 1971, $156,000. Ray Manion, Project Manager, McRel, Mid-Continent Regional Educational Laboratory, Kansas City, Missouri. Report.

KENTUCKY
State Department of Education
Frankfort 40601

INSTITUTE FOR TRAINING VOCATIONAL EDUCATION STAFF IN THE SYSTEMS APPROACH TO ANNUAL AND LONG-RANGE PLANNING-- Ds; Bureau of Vocational Education, Clayton Omvig, Director, Research Coordinating Unit, September 1970-June 1970, $24,313. No report.

INTER-DISCIPLINARY PROGRAM IN VOCATIONAL EDUCATION giving a first year of orientation and exposure leading to a second year of on-the-job training--Dm; Research Coordinating Unit, July 1968-June 1970, $25,195. Herbert Bruce, Director, Instructional Materials Laboratory, University of Kentucky, No report.

PHASE--ELECTIVE ENGLISH offering short term, nongraded elective courses in 30 secondary schools--Dv; Office of Curriculum Development, Martha F. Ellison, 1967 and continuing. Report.

PILOT PROGRAM FOR TRAINING IN POSTAL AND MAIL ROOM OCCUPATIONS giving a one-year course for high school seniors using simulated environment--R Dm; Research Coordinating Unit, 1968-70, $11,000. William Aiken, Director of Vocational Education, Jefferson County Schools, Louisville, Kentucky. Report.

READING IMPROVEMENT FOR VOCATIONAL STUDENTS WITH SPECIAL NEEDS providing individualized reading geared to occupational training programs--R; Research Coordinating Unit, November 1968-June 1970 $6,641. Ronald West, Bowling Green Area Vocational School, Bowling Green, Kentucky, No report.

SELF-INITIATED EVALUATION PROCEDURES FOR SECONDARY PROGRAMS OF VOCATIONAL AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION teaching local educational agencies evaluation techniques by follow-up of graduates and cost-effectiveness study--R; Bureau of Vocational Education, Floyd McKinney and Alfred Mannebach, Research Coordinating Unit, July 1970-June 1971, $15,000. No report.

SIMULATED OCCUPATIONAL EXPERIENCES IN AREA VOCATIONAL SCHOOLS training high school students in distributive education--R Dm; Research Coordinating Unit, 1968-70, $9,443. Clayton Riley, Division of Distributive Education, Department of Vocational Education. No report.

STUDENT INTERESTS and VOCATIONAL EDUCATION evaluating the vocational educational offerings by identifying student occupational interests--E; Research Coordinating Unit, Steven Gyuro, June-November 1970, $500. No report.

TYPEWRITING AND TYPING HABITS providing data on the significance of "looking" in learning and teaching typewriting--R; Research Coordinating ating Unit, January 1968-June 1970, $1,440. John A. Dickinson, Business and Office of Education, University of Kentucky. No report.

MAINE
State Department of Education
Augusta, Maine 04330

CONCEPTUAL APPROACH TO LANGUAGE IN KINDERGARTEN comparing the effectiveness of an informal language arts experience program and a formal, workbook-based approach--R Dv Dm Ds E; Bureau of Elementary Education, 1967-68. C. Michael P. O'Donnell, State Supervisor of Reading. Report.

EVALUATION OF ADULT BASIC EDUCATION examining materials, classroom methods, teacher caliber, and procedures for recruiting and follow-up--E; State Department of Education, 1968-70, $14,000. Roger Axford. Report.

TITLE III ESEA--Ds E; Leroy D. Nisbett, Coordinator - Title III, 1968 and continuing, $12,700. No report.

MARYLAND
State Department of Education
Baltimore 21218

DEVELOPMENT OF STATE-WIDE EDUCATIONAL INFORMATION SYSTEM providing regional "skill centers" and data processing facilities for local school districts--R; Division of Research and Development, Richard K. McKay, July 1967-March 1968, $57,000. Report.

DISCIPLINE IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS investigating by committee the discipline problems through school policy data and interviews and recommending improvements--R; Division of Research and Development, Richard K. McKay, December 1967-May 1968. Report.

GOVERNOR'S STUDY GROUP OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION locating available resource and project funds necessary to meet needs of handicapped by 1975--R; Division of Vocational Rehabilitation, August 1965-August 1968, $240,206. Mr. Sherman Lazrus, outside contractor. Report.

PUBLIC SCHOOL SMOKING STUDY determining the extent of student smoking on school premises and reactiviating the by-law prohibiting this--R; Division of Instruction, April-July 1967. Elizabeth A. Spurrier, Staff Specialist in Evaluation, Division of Planning, Research and Evaluation. Report.

REHABILITATION OF HANDICAPPED RESIDENTS OF BALTIMORE MODEL CITIES finding more effective ways to service handicapped residents, using indigenous aides to communicate with the population, with possible development of nonverbal techniques--R Dm; Division of Vocational Rehabilitation, Merl D. Myers, November 1969-October 1970 and continuing, $221,564. No report.

MICHIGAN
State Department of Education
Lansing 48902

EDUCATIONAL ASSESSMENT PROGRAM collecting, analyzing, and disseminating information drawn from state files and from a basic skills inventory and questionnaire administered to pupils in grades 4 and 7. --R, Ds, E; Bureau of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment, 1969-70 and continuing, $248,000. Robert J. Huyser, Coordinator, Educational Assessment Services. Report.

EVALUATION OF SECTION.III, STATE AID ACT--Dm Ds E; Bureau of Research, Evaluation and Assessment, 1969-70 and continuing, $175,000. Allen Ahola, Research Consultant. Report.

TASK FORCE ON GOALS OF EDUCATION providing measures for use of Assessment Program in investigating levels of educational performance--R; Bureau of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment, February-June 1970. C. Philip Kearney, Associate Superintendent, Department of Education. Report.

MINNESOTA
State Department of Education
St. Paul 55101

ANALYSIS OF SCHOOL COSTS AND STATE AID tracing effects of changes in aid formulas and projecting impact of proposed changes by computer run--R Ds E; Research Section, Division of Administration, 1961-70 and continuing, $32,900. S. Walter Harvey, Director of Research, State Aids, and Statistics. Report.

EVALUATION OF ADULT BASIC EDUCATION PROGRAMS--E; Adult Education Unit, 1969-70, $6,400. William Keenan, Administrator, Minnesota National Laboratory, Inc. Report.

MISSOURI
State Department of Education
Jefferson City 65101

AUTO-INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS FOR OCCUPATIONAL INFORMATION AND CAREER DEVELOPMENT providing units for pre-service and in-service training of counselors and vocational personnel--Dv; Marion Hosinski, Research Coordinating Unit, 1969-70, $4,000. No report.

PROCEDURES FOR SELECTION OF PRACTICAL NURSING STUDENTS--R Dv; Research Coordinating Unit, 1969-70, $5,000. John Ferguson, Professor of Education, University of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri. No report.

SPEECH AND LANGUAGE PROGRAM providing diagnosis, therapy, and classroom language stimulation for the trainable mentally retarded--Dm; State Schools for Retarded Children, 1968 and continuing, $41,500. For additional information: Barbara J. Seelyn, Department of Communication Disorders, St. Louis University, St. Louis, Missouri. Report.

SURVEY OF INDUSTRIAL ARTS TEACHERS--R; Eugene Brightwell, Supervisor of Industrial Arts Education and Glenn W. White, Director, Research Coordinating Unit, 1969-70, $4,000. Report.

NEW JERSEY
State Department of Education
Trenton 08625

MICRO SOCIAL LEARNING CENTER providing an innovative classroom generating high learner responsivity and confidence to sustain activity--Dm; Myron Woolman, Office of Planning Research and Evaluation, no dates, $126,000 per year. Report.

SINGLE CONCEPT LOOP FILMS IN TEACHING OCCUPATIONAL SKILLS TO DISADVANTAGED LEARNERS investigating whether skills are more readily acquired by supplementing personal teaching instruction with films--Dm; Bureau of Occupational Research Development, Division of Vocational Education, March - August 1970, $1,965. Cy Sommers. graduate degree candidate. No report.

NEW YORK
State Department of Education
Albany 12224

EMPLOYMENT FOLLOW-UP surveying 1965-69 graduates of Nassau County industrial-technical-vocational program to determine the compatibility of the program with job performance and the extent to which those trained are utilized by industry--E; Bureau of Educational Research, July-December 1970, $36,060. Frances J. Russo, Nassau County BOCES. No report.

ESEA, TITLE I LONGITUDINAL STUDY providing information on achievement and program activities for a selected group of students in ten urban school systems--E; Bureau of Urban and Community Programs, Eileen Kelly, Associate in Education Research, 1968-71. No report.

EVALUATION OF ETV identifying problems and success of Instructional Television between 1966 and 1968 in schools-E; Bureau of Department Programs Evaluation, January-July 1969, $10,000. Frederick Knirk, Professor of Education, Syracuse University. Report.

EVALUATION OF SECONDARY SCHOOL HOME ECONOMICS PROGRAMS determining the relationship between student progress toward course objectives and progress toward obtaining and holding a job--E; Bureau of Occupational Education Research, 1965-67, $27,626. Helen Nelson, Professor of Home Economics Education, Cornell University. Report.

THE FROSTIG AS A PREDICTOR OF READING DIFFICULTIES testing the use of Frostig in K, comparing its use to other reading criteria, and assessing its relationship to measures of classroom behavior--R E; Bureau of School and Cultural Research, 1964-66, $29,181. Edward B. Homsey, School Psychologist, Greece Central Schools. Report.

IMPLEMENTING EDUCATIONAL CHANGE offering Saturday seminars conducted by professionals in the community for students in grades 6 through 12--Dv Dm; Bureau of School and Cultural Research, 1966-67, $36,783. John Champlin, Assistant Superintendent of Schools, South Orangetown. Report.

INDIVIDUALIZED INSTRUCTION IN MATHEMATICS examining effects on student achievement and attitudes in grades 1 through 6--R Dv; Bureau of School and Cultural Research, 1968-69, $39,828. William Mead, Elementary Principal and Lawrence M. Griffith, Assistant Coordinator of Elementary Education, Horseheads Schools. Report.

INDIVIDUALLY PRESCRIBED INSTRUCTION IN NINTH GRADE SCIENCE utilizing Learning Activity Packages--R Dv E; Bureau of School and Cultural Research, 1969-70 and continuing, $34,844. Olcott Gardner, Director of Research, Jamesville Dewitt Central School District. Report.

LANGUAGE INTERVENTION FOR DISADVANTAGED CHILDREN providing school personnel with information on language development and intervention project, with critical reviews of research and recommendations for future research and programs--R Ds E; Bureau of School and Cultural Research, 1969-70, $5,000. Vernon C. Hall, Associate Professor in Psychology Syracuse University, and Michael Mery, Assistant Professor in Psychology, Mary Washington College. Report.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS IN EDUCATION developing objective methods of evaluating performance of schools using computer based programs--Dv Dm; Bureau of School Programs Evaluation, David J. Irvine, Chief, March 1967 and continuing, $188,228. Report.

PROJECT UNDERSTANDING establishing an elementary learning center for remedial work with small groups or individuals--R Dm; Bureau of School and Cultural Research, 1966-68, $96,492. Robert Kraus, Principal, Mamaroneck Avenue School, Mamaroneck. Report.

REDUCING INJURIES IN INTERSCHOLASTIC HIGH SCHOOL COMPETITION investigating modifications of athletic equipment--R; Bureau of School and Cultural Research, 1967-69, $23, 550. J. Kenneth Hafner, Field Representative, New York State Public High School Athletic Association. Report.

SIMULATION MATERIALS FOR OCCUPATIONAL AWARENESS providing culturally disadvantaged students with role models and knowledge to enable the non-college bound to function in the work force--R Dv; Bureau of Educational Research, 1968-70. John T. Needham, Indiana University. No report.

STUDY OF BUFFALO SCHOOLS developing overall plans for financing, racial balance, school facilities, and staffing--R Dv E; Commissioner's Office, 1965-67, $100,000. Lorne H. Woolatt, Associate Commissioner. Report.

TOTAL IMMERSION LANGUAGE PROGRAM giving courses in social studies and humanities conducted in a foreign languag -Dv; Bureau of School and Cultural Research, 1966-69, $61,242. Stefano Morel, Chairman, Foreign Language Department, Commack Schools. Report.

VISUAL-MOTOR-PERCEPTUAL TRAINING determining the effect or primary level children with reading and learning deficiencies--R Dv;Bureau of School and Cultural Research, 1969-70, $23,055. Tickner Litchfield, Assistant Superintendent, Ramapo Central School District No. 1. Report.

VISUAL TRAINING IN ELEMENTARY EDUCATION drawing on personal experimentation and published literature to develop a program for improving eye-hand coordination--Dv; Bureau of School and Cultural Research, 1966-68, $16,999. Alice M. Rohr, School Psychologist, Albany-Schenectady-Schoharie BOCES. Report.

NORTH CAROLINA

Department of Public Instruction
Raleigh 27602

EDUCATIONAL PERSONNEL DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION B-52 assessing intensive teacher training program for non-education AB degree holders--Dv E; Division of Research, April 1969-June 1970, $428,000. H.O. O'Connell, Research Consultant, and outside contractors. Report.

RATIONALE, GOALS, AND PLANS FOR EDUCATIONAL IMPROVEMENT studying long-range goals and recommendations for implementation-R; January 1970-June 1970. H.T. Connor, Director, and Vester M. Mulholland, Special Consultant, Planning, Research, and Development. Report.

STUDY OF MANPOWER NEEDS AND EDUCATIONAL INTERESTS WITHIN THE COUNTIES SERVED BY RICHMOND TECHNICAL INSTITUTE analyzing vocational interests of high school students, present curriculum, and projected business manpower needs--R; Occupational Research Unit, March 1970-October 1970. Ken Melvin, Director of Occupational Education, Richmond Technical Institute. No report.

NORTH DAKOTA

Department of Public Instruction
Bismark 58501

STATEWIDE STUDY OF EDUCATION--R Dv Ds E; January 1966-July 1967, $80,000. Kent Alm, Professor of Education, University of North Dakota Report.

OHIO
State Department of Education
Columbus 43215

ASSESSING TEACHER EDUCATION AND TEACHING determining teacher-learner roles and effective preparation, and assisting with teacher synthesis of subject matter--R Ds; Division of Research, Planning and Development, March 1969-70, $72,984. Educational Research Council of America. No report.

ASSESSMENT OF THE NEEDS OF FAMILY LIFE EDUCATION studying particularly the areas of drugs and alcohol abuse, human sexuality, and aggressive behavior--R; Division of Research, Planning and Development, June 1968-February 1969, $124,538. Russell A. Working, Director, Division of Research, Planning and Development, Educational Research Council of America, Columbus, Ohio. Report.

FAMILY LIFE EDUCATION NEEDS ASSESSMENT providing a base for development of curriculum materials--R Ds; Division of Research, Planning and Development, June 1968-February 1969 and continuing, $80,098. Ralph Ojemann, Education Research Council of America. Report.

NEEDS ASSESSMENT OF EDUCATIONALLY DISADVANTAGED YOUTH IN XENIA recommending student achievement commensurate with ability--R Ds E; Division of Research, Planning and Development, February-June 1969, $33,100. Aaron C. Page, Director of Personnel, Science Research Associates. Report.

RHODE ISLAND
State Department of Education
Providence 02908

ASSESSMENT OF EDUCATION NEEDS including establishment of Needs Advisory Council and development of Needs Assessment Model--R Ds; Title III, ESEA, Instructional Services, State Agency for Elementary and Secondary Education, 1968-71, $111,000. David Vigneau, University Consultant, University of Rhode Island Research and Development Center and Robert Ricci, Consultant, Title III, ESEA. Report.

DROPOUT STUDY reporting characteristics of individual dropouts and their families--R, Ds, E; State Agency for Elementary and Secondary Education, Stewart R. Essex, Coordinator of School Plant Planning, 1965-70, $20,000. Report.

ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION developing a Vocational Education curriculum with provisions for training, placement, and evaluation of students--R Dv Dm; Division of Vocational Education, 1970-71, $23,107. John Llyden, Chairman, Department of Agriculture, Scituate School Department. Report.

MARINE AGRICULTURE STUDIES exploring the need for curriculum development in specific areas of Marine Studies--R Dv; Division of Vocational Education, June-December 1970, $4,878. Thomas Sandham, Jr., Chairman, Department of Agriculture, North Kingstown High School. Report.

REVISION OF STATE PLAN FOR TITLE II ESEA enabling media centers to meet new demands--R Dv Dm Ds E; Agency for Elementary and Secondary Education, Instructional Services, 1966-70 and continuing $125,000. Ruth W. Cerjanec, School Media Centers and Title II ESEA. Report.

SCHOOL DISTRICT REORGANIZATION PLAN developing criteria for regionalization--R Dv Ds E; State Agency for Elementary and Secondary Education, Edward F. Wilcox, Associate Director, Research and Planning, 1969-71, $100,000. No report.

TRAINING PROGRAM FOR ENVIRONMENTAL POLLUTION CONTROL TECHNICIANS (PHASE I) determining the need for specifically trained laboratory technicians--R Dm; Division of Vocational Education, July-August 1970, $2,412. Joseph Abraham, Industrial Chemistry Instructor, Coventry School Department. Report.

SOUTH CAROLINA
State Department of Education
Columbia 29201

DIALECT DIFFERENCES AND THE LANGUAGE ARTS PROGRAM IN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL developing classroom material for teachers of grades 1, 2 and 3--R Dv Dm Ds E; Office of General Education May-November 1970, $7,000. W. Bruce Crowley, Director. No report.

PRE-SCHOOL FOR HEARING HANDICAPPED a model for language development program--Dm; State Department of Education, 1968-70 and continuing, $154,754, David Halcolmbe. Report.

PILOT PROGRAMS IN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL GUIDANCE--Ds; Guidance Services Office, 1965-69, $270,000. Virginia Craig, Elementary Guidance Consultant. Report

TEXAS
State Department of Education
Austin 78711

CONFERENCE FOR INNOVATIVE AND EXEMPLARY EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS--Ds; Education Service Centers I & XX, James Clark, Director, Title III, ESEA, and Virginia Cutter, Director, Division of Dissemination, May 1968, $3,000. No report.

HOME ECONOMICS INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS PROJECT emphasising development of vocational preparation materials--Dv; Occupational Research Coordinating Unit, September 1967-June 1970, $230,978. Willa V. Tinsley, Dean of School of Home Economics, Texas Technological University, Lubbock, Texas. Additional information from project director.

PLAN FOR A VOCATIONAL, INDUSTRIAL, AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION CURRICULUM CENTER--Dv; Occupational Research Coordinating Unit, February 1967-January 1968, $12,909. Fred J. Benson, Texas A & M University. Report.

REVIEW OF DRIVER EDUCATION TEACHING ASSISTANT PLAN--E; Division of Program Development, G. L. Peavy, Program Director, Safety and Driver Education, November 1968 - December 1969, $12,320. Report.

TRAINING PROGRAM FOR HOSPITAL CENTRAL SERVICE TECHNICIANS developing instructional materials and selecting participants from the disadvantaged community--Dv; Occupational Research Coordinating Unit. September 1967-June 1968, $14,090. El Centro College, Dallas, Texas. Report.

WASHINGTON
State Department of Education
Olympia 98501

OPERATION HELP providing for potential dropouts shop and field experience to develop skills for employment in forests--Dv; Research Coordinating Unit, September 1969 and continuing, $17,422. Rodney Hahn, Director of Vocational Education, Newport Public School, Newport Washington. No report.

WISCONSIN
State Department of Public Instruction
Madison 53702

EDUCATIONAL NEEDS ASSESSMENT STUDY--R; Center for Research and Program Development, May-October 1969, $17,000. Jim Lipham, Professor of Educational Administration, University of Wisconsin Report.

EDUCATIONAL NEEDS ASSESSMENT STUDY--R; Title III, ESEA, 1968-69, $22,780. Russell S. Way,. Center for Research and Program Development. Report.

PROBLEMS IN SPECIAL EDUCATION developing a series of instructional films for teachers--Dv Ds; Division for Handicapped Children, 1969-70, $49,500. Charlotte J. Richards, Program Administrator, P.L. 88-164. Report.

STATE AIDS AND SCHOOL FINANCE DATA PROCESSING developing a new system that anticipates information requests--Dv; Division of State Aid and School Finance, and Division of Field Services, April-November 1970. James S. Fosdick, Research Analyst. Report.