

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 174 785

CE 022 263

AUTHOR Smith, Terry R.
 TITLE On-Site Evaluation of Occupational Education Programs in Illinois. Executive Summary.
 INSTITUTION Illinois Univ., Urbana. Dept. of Vocational and Technical Education.
 SPONS AGENCY Illinois State Office of Education, Springfield. Div. of Adult Vocational and Technical Education.
 PUB DATE Jun 79
 NOTE 49p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
 DESCRIPTORS Community Resources; Comprehensive High Schools; Evaluation Methods; Occupational Guidance; Planning; Program Administration; Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; *Program Improvement; School Surveys; Secondary Education; *State Programs; Student Participation; Teacher Evaluation; *Vocational Education
 IDENTIFIERS Illinois

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to evaluate the on-site evaluation phase of the three-phase system for statewide evaluation of occupational education programs in Illinois. The specific problem was to explore the nature of selected changes in the occupational education programs of comprehensive secondary schools over five years and the extent to which these changes may be related to the on-site evaluation process. Data were collected on the fifteen comprehensive secondary school districts in the sample through two questionnaires administered to selected local education agency (LEA) personnel and the on-site evaluation. Among the findings were that (1) both LEA personnel and on-site evaluation team members agreed that there had been improvement in all occupational education program components and that the on-site evaluation had contributed to that improvement; (2) both LEA personnel and team members reported that the on-site evaluations were a beneficial and worthwhile investment of resources, and (3) LEA personnel and on-site team members agreed as to the relative improvement in each of the program components. (LRA)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

ED174785

ON-SITE EVALUATION OF OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS IN ILLINOIS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Terry R. Smith
Principal Investigator

Robert M. Tomlinson
Project Director

Department of
Vocational and Technical Education
University of Illinois
at Urbana-Champaign

Sponsored by:
Research and Development Section
Department of Adult,
Vocational and Technical Education
Springfield, Illinois

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

June, 1979

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN-
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT
OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

The project entitled "On-Site Evaluation of Occupational Education Programs in Illinois," funding agreement number RD1-B9-126 was developed pursuant to a funding agreement with the Illinois Office of Education/Department of Adult, Vocational and Technical Education/Research and Development Section, 100 North First Street, Springfield, Illinois 62777. Opinions expressed in this Executive Summary do not reflect, nor should they be construed as policy or opinion of the State Board of Education/Illinois Office of Education or its staff.

01 022 263

Preface

This study was undertaken as a part of the on-going program of research, teaching and service of the Department of Vocational and Technical Education at the University of Illinois. It represents a part of the continuing cooperative efforts among the University, the Department of Adult, Vocational and Technical Education (DAVTE), Illinois Office of Education, the local educational agencies and the occupational educators of Illinois.

The University had had a contract to assist in the carrying out of the Three Phase System (TPS) of Evaluation since its inception. Much of the data of record are housed at the University. Ms Antionette Wirth was associated with this TPS activity since the early years of its operation and provided essential assistance in several aspects of the study.

The entire study was undertaken with combined purposes: to provide one aspect of evaluation of the TPS and to serve as the mechanisms for a doctoral dissertation for Mr. Terry R. Smith. This combined approach provides both immediate benefits to the field through the research reports and related presentations and long-term benefits through the experiences gained by professional personnel in the field.

The study resulted in a more detailed and comprehensive Technical Report (which was also the doctoral dissertation) this Executive Summary, and supplemental information which can be utilized by DAVTE in reviewing the TPS. A limited number of copies of the complete Technical Report have been provided to DAVTE; copies of the dissertation are on deposit at the University of Illinois library or available through University Microfilm and the ERIC system. The Technical Report includes detailed descriptions of the analyses, procedures and research instruments as well as a number of tables of data which were not fully analyzed for this study.

The project staff takes this opportunity to express appreciation to those local school districts and their personnel, the members of the on-site evaluation teams, the DAVTE Regional Directors and others who gave of their time and efforts so that this study could be carried out. A special recognition is given to the members of the study advisory committee: Peter Johnson, Warren Collier, Harold Finn and John Washburn.

It is hoped that this study will make a contribution to the occupational education students who are the ultimate reason for the existence of the occupational education programs and their personnel at all levels.

Robert M. Tomlinson
Project Director

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
Evaluation in Occupational Education	1
On-Site Evaluation	2
The Occupational Education Evaluation System in Illinois	3
Purpose of the Study	3
Statement of the Problem	4
The Population and Sample	5
Data Collection Procedures	6
Data Collection by the Follow-Up Questionnaires.	7
Collection of Data of Record	7
Descriptive Overview of the Sample	8
Selection and Description of the Sample LEAs	8
Occupational Education Student Sample.	9
LEA Occupational Education Personnel Sample.	10
On-Site Evaluation Team Member Sample.	12
Summary of Findings for Research Question 1	13
Planning and Evaluation.	13
Student Services	15
Occupational Programs.	17
Personnel.	19
Program Management	21
Use of Community Resources	23
Summary of Findings for Research Question 2.	24
The Relationship Between Improvements in the Occupational Education Program and the On-Site Evaluation as Reported by LEA Personnel	24
The Relationship Between Improvements in the Occupational Education Program and the On-Site Evaluation as Reported by On-Site Evaluation Team Members	26
Summary of Findings for Research Question 3.	27
The Value of the On-Site Evaluation as Reported by LEA Personnel	28
The Value of the On-Site Evaluation as Reported by On-Site Evaluation Team Members	32

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

	PAGE
Discussion	34
Major Findings	41
Conclusions.	42
Recommendations.	43
List of References	44

ON-SITE EVALUATION OF OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS IN ILLINOIS

Program evaluation at the local, state and federal levels is being given increased importance. Accrediting agencies, local, state and national organizations and governmental agencies at every level are demanding that the educational agencies and institutions provide reports of program evaluation which demonstrate accountability for the funds received and the clientele served.

In response to the need for greater accountability, state and federal education agencies have implemented evaluation requirements into their funding policies and procedures. These requirements have been developed to allow the state and federal education agencies to obtain data on the quantity and quality of the educational programs offered at the local and state levels. It was the intent that with these data it would be possible for the state and federal education agencies to make decisions concerning the present programs and to plan future programs, funding and research activities.

Evaluation in Occupational Education

The area of occupational education has been extensively involved in the move towards greater program evaluation and providing accountability information to state and federal education agencies. Federal legislation enacted in 1963 (Vocational Education Act of 1963, PL-88-210) required the evaluation of all funded vocational education programs and activities; this Act marked the beginning of the formal process of evaluating vocational education programs.

2

The structure for evaluating vocational education was further expanded in 1968. The Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 (Public Law 90-576) required each state to participate in the planning and evaluation of the vocational education programs within their state.

Included as Title II of the Education Amendments of 1976 (Public Law 94-482) are the Vocational Education Amendments of 1976 which further extend the requirements for evaluation of vocational education. To be eligible to receive federal vocational funds, the Vocational Education Amendments of 1976 required that state Departments of Vocational Education agencies provide the US Office of Education with more specific data and on additional components of the local and state vocational education programs than previously were required by the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968.

On-Site Evaluation

Several states have implemented statewide evaluation systems, in meeting these evaluation requirements, which include an on-site evaluation component as a part of the evaluation process. These on-site evaluations are made by evaluation teams which may differ in structure and composition from state to state. In some states the team is composed of state vocational education department personnel. In other states the team is composed of local education agency (LEA) personnel (instructors, guidance personnel and administrators), business, industry and labor personnel, and present or former occupational education students. Some states use a combination of these patterns, including both state personnel and local personnel on the on-site evaluation team.

7

The Occupational Education Evaluation System in Illinois

In 1969, the Illinois State Board of Vocational Education and Rehabilitation developed provisions for a statewide evaluation system as a part of their State Plan. The statewide evaluation system was designed to provide for the evaluation of all local vocational education programs, services and activities in terms of meeting the needs, interests and abilities of individual students. The system was called the Three Phase System for Statewide Evaluation of Occupational Education programs (TPS).

As the title implies, the evaluation system developed in Illinois is comprised of three phases: (1) local district planning of the occupational education program which culminates in a written One and Five Year Plan for Occupational Education for the LEA (this plan must be up-dated each year), (2) an annual review of the LEA's plan by the staff of the Illinois Department of Adult, Vocational and Technical Education (DAVTE), and (3) an on-site evaluation once each five years which is conducted by a team of individuals not associated with the LEA being evaluated or DAVTE (Wentling and Klit, 1972).

Purpose of the Study

Illinois has expended large amounts of time and money in developing and carrying out its TPS which includes an on-site evaluation phase. This system was developed to evaluate the existing, complete occupational education program and to provide recommendations to the local and state education agencies for improvement of the local occupational education program.

4

The results of this study provide a basis for recommendations which will be directed toward improvement of the on-site evaluation phase and to obtain a greater return on the investment being made in the on-site evaluation phase of the Illinois TPS. The findings will also be of benefit to other states using a similar on-site evaluation procedure.

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study was to explore the nature of selected changes in the occupational education programs of comprehensive secondary schools over a period of five years, and the extent to which these changes may be related to the on-site evaluation process.

The nature of selected changes in the occupational education programs was explored by the use of information which was obtained at three different periods of time. Data collected during a first on-site evaluation provided a baseline. Data obtained at a similar, second on-site evaluation conducted five years later provided a second source of data from the same LEAs. The third source of data was from follow-up questionnaires administered to selected LEA personnel and to each member of the on-site evaluation teams that was involved in the second on-site visit to the selected LEAs.

Some of the information selected to explore the nature of changes in the occupational education programs came from the following, existing data of record which were obtained as a part of the first and second on-site visits: the Preliminary Evaluation Instrument - Personnel (PEI-P) and Preliminary Evaluation Instrument - Student (PEI-S) data, the Evaluation Team Reports (ETRs), and the One and Five Year Plans submitted by the LEAs to the state DAVTE.

5

To explore possible relationships between the selected changes under investigation and the on-site evaluation phase, information also was obtained by questionnaire, from selected LEA personnel and from the members of the on-site evaluation team who participated in the second on-site visit. The selected LEA personnel included occupational instructors, guidance personnel and occupational education administrators. Each was asked to provide information relative to his/her perceptions of the extent to which changes in the occupational education programs were related to the on-site evaluation process. Each also was asked to cite benefits gained from the on-site evaluation. In addition, the members of the respective second on-site evaluation teams were asked to provide information relative to their perceptions of the extent to which they found changes in the occupational education programs related to the on-site evaluation process and to cite benefits that they, individually, may have received by serving as a team member.

The Population and Sample

The population for this study consisted of all public comprehensive secondary schools in the state of Illinois offering an occupational education program. From this population a sub-population was identified which consisted of approximately fifty comprehensive secondary schools. This sub-population was composed of all such schools which had received their first on-site visit in 1972-1973 and their second on-site evaluation during the 1977-1978 school year.

The sample for this study was comprised of fifteen comprehensive secondary school districts. This sample was selected from the fifty

eligible, comprehensive secondary school districts which had received their second on-site evaluation during the 1977-1978 school year. The sample was stratified to include various sizes of LEAs from the various regions of the state and to provide a representative sample of these LEAs.

Two LEAs were selected from each of the seven Illinois Office of Education regions outside the city of Chicago and one remaining LEA was selected at large. This selection process facilitated the selection of LEAs which represented the various geographic areas within the state.

Within each region, the eligible LEAs were grouped by total student population at the secondary level into two classifications; those with a larger than median enrollment and those with a smaller than median enrollment within that region. One LEA from each size classification was selected for the study. One additional LEA was selected from those LEAs that were not previously selected. This procedure facilitated the selection of LEAs which represented the various sizes of schools within the state.

Data Collection Procedures

To accomplish this investigation, the following procedures were utilized:

1. Two questionnaires were developed to obtain data from selected LEA personnel and on-site evaluation team members after the second on-site evaluation.
2. Selected data of record were obtained from DAVTE records of student and LEA personnel responses at the time of the first and second on-site evaluations. These data of record included: PEI (student and personnel) data

and the ETRs for the first and second on-site evaluations.

3. The data obtained from the selected LEA personnel, on-site evaluation team members and the data of record were analyzed in response to the research questions formulated for the study.

Data Collection by the Follow-Up Questionnaires

Data collection by the two follow-up questionnaires began on April 20, 1978 and continued until June 1, 1978. The time schedule for data collection involved the initial mailing and two follow-up mailings at two week intervals. Two weeks after the initial mailing, those individuals who had not returned their follow-up questionnaire received a follow-up letter, a second copy of the follow-up questionnaire and another return addressed, stamped envelope.

Two weeks later, the third mailing was made to those individuals who still had not responded to the initial or second mailing. This final follow-up also contained a follow-up letter, another copy of the follow-up questionnaire and another return addressed, stamped envelope. Six weeks after the initial mailing, the data collection by follow-up questionnaire was completed.

Collection of Data of Record

The data of record utilized for the study had been collected at two points in time, five years apart. These data were collected as a part of the on-site evaluation phase of the TPS. Data for the selected LEAs from both the first and second on-site evaluations were used in this study. The data of record include the PEI data for the students and faculty, the

evaluation team report and a Team On-Site Evaluation Instrument. The Team On-Site Evaluation Instrument was completed by the team leader with input provided from the team members. This was usually completed after the evaluation team report was completed and prior to an exit interview.

Descriptive Overview of the Sample

The sample for this study included the following groups associated with the fifteen LEAs: occupational education students, LEA occupational education personnel and on-site evaluation team members. Data were obtained from occupational education student at the time of the first and second on-site evaluations. Data also were obtained from LEA occupational education personnel at the time of the first and second on-site evaluations. In addition, data were obtained from the LEA occupational education personnel by a follow-up questionnaire sent to the personnel after the second on-site evaluation and from the on-site evaluation team members by a follow-up questionnaire.

Selection and Description of the Sample LEAs

The fifteen LEAs were selected to represent the various sizes and locations of LEAs within the state of Illinois, two from within each of the seven IOE regions and one selected at large.

Region and Enrollment of the LEAs in the Sample

Six of the LEAs had a total enrollment at the secondary level of less than 750 students, five had enrollments of between 751 and 1500 students while four had enrollments of more than 1500 students. These



enrollments provided a cross section of LEAs within the state of Illinois by LEA size. For each region a median student enrollment was computed for those LEAs eligible for selection. The median student enrollment by region varied from over 4500 students for Cook County to under 900 for region four.

Occupational Education Student Sample

The total number of occupational education students from the fifteen selected LEAs who responded to the Preliminary Evaluation Instruments - Student Form (PEI-S) at the time of the first on-site evaluation was 1387. For the second on-site evaluation the number of occupational education students who responded to the PEI-S was 1867.

Grade Level of Students

At the time of the first on-site evaluation, approximately 43% of the sample were classified as seniors with about 32% classified as juniors, 17% classified as sophomores and 7% classified as freshmen. At the time of the second on-site evaluation almost half (49.8%) were classified as seniors with approximately 26% classified as juniors, 18% classified as sophomores and 6% classified as freshmen.

Occupational Area of Students

At the time of the first on-site evaluation, 45.2% of the occupational education students who completed the PEI-S were classified in the business occupational area, 29.9% were classified in the industrial occupational area, 17.7% were classified in the home economics occupational area, 4.7% were classified in the health occupations occupational area, and 2.5% were classified in the agriculture occupational area.

For the second on-site evaluation, 36.0% of the occupational education students were classified in the business occupational area, 33.7% were classified in the industrial occupational area, 18.1% were classified in the home economics occupational area, 6.3% were classified in the health occupations occupational area and 5.9% were classified in the agriculture occupational area.

LEA Occupational Education Personnel Sample

Data were obtained from LEA occupational education personnel at three different times: 1) for the first on-site evaluation, 2) for the second on-site evaluation, and 3) by follow-up questionnaire. The total number of LEA occupational education personnel from the fifteen selected LEAs who responded to the Preliminary Evaluation Instrument - Personnel Form (PEI-P) at the time of the first on-site evaluation was 231 and for the second on-site evaluation the total who responded to the PEI-P was 408. From the two on-site evaluations combined, a total of 639 PEI-P questionnaires were obtained for this study. The total number of LEA occupational education personnel from the fifteen selected LEAs who responded to the LEA Personnel Follow-Up Questionnaire was 321.

Personnel by Assignment at the First and Second On-Site Evaluations

At the time of the first on-site evaluation 69.3% of the occupational education personnel sample were classified as having Instruction as their assignment, 15.2% classified as Guidance and 15.5% classified as Administration. At the time of the second on-site evaluation 68.6% of the sample were classified as in Instruction with 14.0% classified as

Guidance and 17.4% classified as Administration.

LEA Personnel by Assignment for the LEA
Personnel Follow-Up Questionnaire

Of the 366 LEA occupational education personnel identified and selected to participate in this study, 321 responded by completing the LEA Personnel Follow-Up Questionnaire and returning it by the end of the data collection period. For all fifteen selected LEAs combined the return rate was 88%. The lowest rate of return for any one LEA was 74%; the highest rate of return was 100% which was accomplished at four LEAs.

Of the sample that responded to the LEA Personnel Follow-Up Questionnaire, 47.4% were classified as Instruction (full time in instruction), 10.3% classified as Guidance (full time in guidance), 13.4% classified as Administration (full time in administration), 10.9% as Other-non-Administration (guidance, instruction, other), and 18.1% classified as Other-Administration (guidance and/or instruction and/or other and administration).

Prior Experience of LEA Occupational
Education Personnel on DAVTE On-Site
Evaluation Teams

Of those LEA personnel classified as Instruction 88.2% reported no prior experience on a DAVTE on-site evaluation team while 11.8% reported prior experience. Only 9.1% of those personnel classified as Guidance reported prior experience on a DAVTE on-site evaluation team; 41.9% of those personnel classified as Administration reported prior experience; 17.1% of those personnel classified as Other-non-Administration reported having prior experience; and, 36.2% of those personnel classified as

Other-Administration reported prior experience on a DAVTE on-site evaluation team. Thus, it was determined that those personnel with administrative assignments, at least, a part of their assignment were more likely to have had prior experience on a DAVTE on-site evaluation than those personnel with no administrative assignment.

The LEA occupational education personnel sample has been grouped on the basis of assignment and prior experience on a DAVTE on-site evaluation for several of the analyses in this study. Two of these sub-groups did not have sufficient numbers of personnel for separate analysis and were not included; they were personnel classified as Guidance who had prior experience on a DAVTE on-site evaluation team and personnel classified as Other-non-Administration who had prior experience on a DAVTE on-site evaluation team.

On-Site Evaluation Team Member Sample

Of the 109 on-site evaluation team members identified and selected to participate in this study, 96 responded by completing the Team Member Follow-Up Questionnaire and returning it by the end of the data collection period.

The return rate was 88% for all fifteen on-site evaluation teams combined. The lowest rate of return for any one on-site evaluation team was 67%; the highest rate was 100% which was accomplished for five teams.

Of the 96 team members who responded to the Team Member Follow-Up Questionnaire, 22.9% were employed in educational administration, 7.3% were employed in guidance, 46.9% were employed as instructors, 14.6% were employed in business, labor or industry, and 8.3% were present or former occupational education students.

Summary of Findings for Research Question 1

Presented in this section is a summary of the findings for Research Question 1. The findings are presented by program component: Planning and Evaluation, Student Services, Occupational Programs, Personnel, Program Management, and Use of Community Resources.

Research Question 1 was:

Have improvements occurred in the occupational education programs from a first on-site evaluation to a second similar on-site evaluation conducted five years later?

Discriminant analysis, analysis of variance (two-way) and Chi-square analysis were selected as the primary statistical tools for data analysis. Discriminant analysis allows for the simultaneous analysis of multiple dependent and independent variables and aids in identifying which, if any, dependent variable(s) contribute to significant differences among the selected team member and LEA personnel sub-groups.

Planning and Evaluation

Guidance, Instruction and Administration personnel all reported a higher level of involvement in this activity at the time of the second on-site evaluation than they did at the first on-site evaluation. The combined level of involvement across all personnel was reported as being somewhat below moderate. LEA personnel were significantly more involved in planning and/or making changes in their districts' One and Five Year Plan for Occupational Education at the time of the second on-site evaluation than at the time of the first on-site evaluation. Personnel classified in Administration reported a significantly higher level of involvement than personnel in Guidance and Instruction.

Substantial improvement in the development and use of stated and measurable objectives was indicated by the comparison of the ETRs for the first and second on-site evaluations. At the time of the first on-site evaluation only one of the fifteen LEAs had stated and measurable objectives for their occupational education program. At the time of the second on-site evaluation the number of LEAs which had such objectives had increased to twelve.

At the time of the first on-site evaluation only one of the fifteen LEAs had an operating local evaluation system for the occupational education program. The number of LEAs that had such activities had increased to eight at the time of the second visit.

LEA personnel reported, via the LEA Personnel Follow-Up Questionnaire, improvement in the Planning and Evaluation program component. Planning and Evaluation received the highest combined mean (2.86 on a scale of 1 = none, 2 = little, 3 = moderate, 4 = extensive) for extent of improvement across all eight selected LEA personnel sub-groups. This combined mean indicated that the eight LEA personnel sub-groups combined reported the extent of improvements in the Planning and Evaluation program component as being about moderate.

Personnel in the Administration-N (no prior experience on a DAVTE on-site evaluation team), Administration-Other-N, and Administration-Y (yes, prior experience on a DAVTE on-site evaluation team) sub-groups reported a greater extent of improvement in the Planning and Evaluation program component than personnel in the other LEA personnel sub-groups. Personnel in the Other-non-Administration-N, Administration-Other-Y sub-groups reported a lesser extent of improvement in the Planning and Evaluation program component than personnel in the other LEA personnel sub-groups.

The on-site evaluation team members reported via the Team Member Follow-Up Questionnaire improvement in the Planning and Evaluation program component. In relation to the team members reported extent of improvements for the other program components, Planning and Evaluation received the lowest reported extent of improvement. The reported extent of improvement for Planning and Evaluation was less than moderate but more than little (2.61). There was no significant differences in the reported extent of improvement in the Planning and Evaluation program component by the team member sub-groups.

Student Services

Occupational education students rated their guidance counselor's knowledge of the world of work somewhat above average but not high at the time of both the first and second on-site evaluations. There was no significant difference found in the students' ratings of their guidance counselors' knowledge of the world of work for the first and the second on-site evaluations. Industrial education students rated their guidance counselors' knowledge of the world of work significantly lower than students in the other four program areas.

The occupational education students rated the information they had received from their guidance counselor with regard to their future occupation as average at the time of both the first and second on-site evaluations. There was no significant difference found in the students' ratings of the information they had received from their guidance counselors with regard to their future occupation for the first and second on-site evaluations.

LEA personnel rated the guidance counselors' knowledge of

occupational course and program offerings about average (1.82 on a scale of 1 = high, 2 = average, 3 = low) at the time of the first on-site evaluation and well above average (1.68) at the time of the second on-site evaluation.

A significant difference was found in the LEA personnel's rating of the guidance counselors' knowledge of occupational and course offerings for the first and second on-site evaluations. Guidance counselors were more knowledgeable about occupational course and program offerings at the time of the second on-site evaluation than at the time of the first on-site evaluation.

Occupational instructors rated the guidance counselors' knowledge of occupational course and program offerings significantly lower than did the other LEA personnel.

Very little improvement in placement services was indicated by the comparison of the ETRs for the first and second on-site evaluations. Some improvement was indicated in the LEAs testing of career interests as was indicated in the availability of more career information.

LEA personnel reported improvement in the Student Services program component. The Student Services program component received the fourth highest combined mean (2.72) for extent of improvement across all eight LEA personnel sub-groups. This combined mean indicated that the eight LEA personnel sub-groups combined reported the extent of improvements in the Student Services program component as being less than moderate but more than little.

Personnel in the Other-non-Administration-N and Administration-Other-Y sub-groups reported a greater extent of improvement in the Student Services program component than personnel in the other LEA personnel sub-groups. Personnel in the Administration-N, Administration-Other-N, and Administration-Y sub-groups reported a lesser extent of

improvement in the Student Services program component than personnel in the other LEA personnel sub-groups.

The on-site evaluation team members also reported improvement in the Student Services program component. The Student Services program component received the fifth highest combined mean (2.77) for extent of improvement across all five team member sub-groups. This combined mean indicated that the five team member sub-groups combined reported the extent of improvements in the Student Services program component as being less than moderate but more than little. There was no significant differences in the reported extent of improvement in the Student Services program component by the team member sub-groups.

Occupational Programs

Occupational education students rated their occupational program in terms of preparation for a career somewhat above average but not high at the time of the first and second on-site evaluations. The combined mean rating for the second on-site visit was higher than for the first on-site visit.

There was a significant difference in the means of the ratings among occupational areas. Students in the home economics program area gave a significantly lower rating of their program's ability to prepare them for an occupation than students in the other program areas.

A significant drop in the percentage of occupational education students participating in student vocational clubs was found. With the exception of the agriculture area, all student organizations were found to have had substantial drops in their student membership. The student vocational clubs in the agriculture area were found to be increasing in their percentage of student membership.

Improvements were noted in the second on-site evaluation ETRs for

sequencing occupational courses into structured programs and in the offering of programs in each of the five occupational areas. Very little improvement, if any, was noted in the support for occupational student organizations.

There has been a substantial increase in the number of conclusions contained in the occupational programs section of the ETRs from the time of the first on-site evaluation (85) to the second on-site evaluation (295).

LEA personnel reported improvement in the Occupational Programs program component. The Occupational Programs program component received the second highest combined mean (2.85) for extent of improvement across all eight LEA personnel sub-groups. This combined mean indicated that the eight LEA personnel sub-groups combined reported the extent of improvements in the Occupational Programs program component as being about moderate.

Personnel in the Administration-N, Administration-Other-N, and Administration-Y reported a greater extent of improvement in the Occupational Programs program component than personnel in the other LEA personnel sub-groups. Personnel in the Other-non-Administration-N and Administration-Other-Y reported a lesser extent of improvement in the Occupational Programs program component than personnel in the other LEA personnel sub-groups.

The on-site evaluation team members also reported improvement in the Occupational Programs program component. The Occupational Programs program component received the highest combined mean (2.96) for extent of improvements across all five team member sub-groups. This combined mean indicated that the five team member sub-groups combined reported the extent of improvements in the Occupational Programs program component as being moderate. There was no significant difference in the reported

extent of improvements in the Occupational Programs program component by the team member sub-groups.

Personnel

Occupational education students rated their occupational instructors' knowledge of the world of work well above average but not high. The occupational education students rated their occupational instructors' knowledge of the world of work significantly higher at the time of the second on-site visit than at the time of the first on-site visit. There was also a significant difference in the means of the ratings among occupational areas. Students in the health occupations program area gave a significantly higher rating and students in the home economics program area gave a significantly lower rating of their instructors' knowledge of the world of work than students in the other program areas.

LEA personnel rated the working relationship between occupational and academic instructors somewhat above average but not high. The LEA personnel rated the working relationship between occupational and academic instructors significantly higher at the time of the second on-site visit than at the time of the first on-site visit. There was also a significant difference in the means of the ratings among personnel assignments. Administrators rated the working relationship significantly higher than did guidance or instructional personnel.

LEA personnel rated the working relationship between guidance and instructional personnel at the time of the first and second on-site visits. There was a significant difference in the means of the ratings among personnel assignments. Occupational instructors rated the working relationship significantly lower than did guidance or administrative personnel.

Improvement in the occupational experience of the occupational education personnel was indicated by the comparison of the ETRs for the first and second on-site evaluations. Improvement was also indicated in the assignment of occupational education personnel to teach in areas for which they were qualified.

LEA personnel reported improvement in the Personnel program component. The Personnel program component received the lowest combined mean (2.57) for extent of improvement across all eight LEA personnel sub-groups. This combined mean indicated that the eight LEA personnel sub-groups combined reported the extent of improvements in the Personnel program component as being about half-way between moderate and little.

Personnel in the Administration-N, and Administration-Other-N, and Administration-Y sub-groups reported a greater extent of improvement in the Personnel program component than personnel in the other LEA personnel sub-groups. Personnel in the Other-non-Administration-N and Administration-Other-Y reported a lesser extent of improvements in the Personnel program component than personnel in the other LEA personnel sub-groups.

The on-site evaluation team members also reported improvement in the Personnel program component. The Personnel program component received the fifth highest combined mean (2.77 - tied with Student Services) for extent of improvements across all five team member sub-groups. This combined mean indicated that the five sub-groups combined reported the extent of improvement in the Personnel program component as being somewhat less than moderate but more than little. There was no significant difference in the reported extent of improvement in the Personnel program component by the team member sub-groups.

Program Management

LEA personnel rated their local board of education's support for occupational education average (1.96) at the time of the first on-site visit and somewhat above average (1.79) at the time of the second on-site visit. The LEA personnel rated the boards' support for occupational education significantly higher at the time of the second on-site visit than at the time of the first on-site visit. There was also a significant difference in the means of the rating among personnel assignments. Administrators rated the boards' support for occupational education significantly higher than did guidance and instructional personnel.

LEA personnel rated the working relationship between occupational instructors across all occupational areas well above average but not high at the time of the first (1.68) and second (1.60) on-site visits. There was no significant difference between the ratings of the working relationship between occupational instructors across all occupational areas at the time of the first and second on-site visits. There was also no significant difference in the means of the ratings among personnel assignments.

LEA personnel rated the working relationship between occupational instructors and occupational program administrators well above average but not high at the time of the first (1.64) and second (1.58) on-site visits. There was no significant difference between the ratings of the working relationship between occupational instructors and occupational program administrators at the time of the first and second on-site visits. There was a significant difference in the means of the ratings among personnel assignments. Administrators rated the working relationships significantly higher than did guidance and instructional personnel.

Improvement in the support for occupational education by local boards of education was indicated by the comparison of the ETRs for the first and second on-site evaluations. Improvement was also indicated in vertical articulation and the use of written job descriptions.

LEA personnel reported improvement in the Program Management program component. The Program Management program component received the fourth highest combined mean (2.67) for extent of improvement across all eight LEA personnel sub-groups. This combined mean indicated that the eight LEA personnel sub-groups combined reported the extent of improvements in the Program Management program component as being somewhat less than moderate but more than little.

Personnel in the Other-non-Administration-N and Administration-Other-Y reported a greater extent of improvement in the Program Management program component than personnel in the other LEA personnel sub-groups. Personnel in the Administration-N, Administration-Other-N, and Administration-Y sub-groups reported a lesser extent of improvement in the Program Management program component than personnel in the other LEA personnel sub-groups.

The on-site evaluation team members also reported improvement in the Program Management program component. The Program Management program component received the third highest combined mean (2.80) for extent of improvements across all five team member sub-groups. This combined mean indicated that the five team member sub-groups combined reported the extent of improvement in the Program Management program component as being a little less than moderate. There was no significant difference in the reported extent of improvements in the Program Management program components by the team member sub-groups.

Use of Community Resources

LEA personnel rated the working relationship between occupational instructors and labor and management personnel in government, business, trade and commerce as being somewhat above average at the time of the first (1.81) and second (1.83) on-site visits. There was no significant difference found in the LEA personnel's rating of this working relationship for the first and second on-site evaluations. There was also no significant difference among the means of the ratings by LEA personnel assignment.

Improvement in the establishment and use of advisory committees was indicated by the comparison of the ETRs for the first and second on-site evaluations.

LEA personnel reported improvement in the Use of Community Resources program component. The Use of Community Resources program component received the third highest combined mean (2.76) for extent of improvement across all eight LEA personnel sub-groups. This combined mean indicated that the eight LEA personnel sub-groups combined reported the extent of improvement in the Use of Community Resources as being somewhat less than moderate.

Personnel in the Administration-N, Administration-Other-N, and Administration-Y reported a greater extent of improvement in the Use of Community Resources program component than personnel in the other LEA personnel sub-groups. Personnel in the Other-non-Administration-N and Administration-Other-Y reported a lesser extent of improvement in the Use of Community Resources program component than personnel in the other LEA personnel sub-groups.

The on-site evaluation team members also reported improvement in the Use of Community Resources program component. The Use of Community Resources program component received the second highest combined mean (2.87) for extent of improvement across all five team member sub-groups. This combined mean indicated that the five team member sub-groups combined reported the extent of improvement in the Use of Community Resources as being about moderate. There was no significant differences in the reported extent of improvement in the Use of Community Resources program component by the team member sub-groups.

Summary of Findings for Research Question 2

Presented in this section is a summary of the findings for Research Question 2. The findings are presented by their source: LEA Personnel Follow-Up Questionnaire and Team Member Follow-Up Questionnaire.

Research Question 2 was:

Was there a relationship between improvements in the occupational education program and the on-site evaluation?

The Relationship Between Improvements in the Occupational Education Program and the On-Site Evaluation as Reported by LEA Personnel

The LEA personnel reported that the planning and evaluation program component had the highest combined mean (2.48) for the extent of relationship between improvement in the occupational program and the first DAVTE on-site evaluation across all eight LEA personnel sub-groups. This combined mean indicated that the combined eight LEA personnel sub-groups rated the extent of relationship between improvement in the Planning and Evaluation program

component and the DAVTE on-site evaluation little to moderate.

The second highest combined mean (2.42) for the extent of relationship between improvement and the DAVTE on-site evaluation was reported for the Occupational Program program component. In order, the other program components were Program Management with a combined mean of 2.38, Use of Community Resources with a combined mean of 2.37, Student Services with a combined mean of 2.77, and Personnel with a combined mean of 2.17. The reported extent of relationship between improvements and the DAVTE on-site evaluation in the six program components ranged from (2.48) little to moderate to (2.17) little.

The LEA personnel sub-group reporting the highest combined mean (2.77) extent of relationship between improvement and the DAVTE on-site evaluation across all six program components was reported by those persons classified as Administration-N. The second highest combined mean (2.64) for extent of relationship between improvement and the DAVTE on-site evaluation across all six program components was reported by persons classified as Instruction-Y. The other LEA personnel sub-groups, in order of combined means were: Administration-Other-N (2.55), Administration-Other-Y (2.40), Instruction-N (2.28), Administration-Y (2.21), Guidance-N (2.11) and Other-non-Administration-N (2.00). The reported extent of relationship between improvement and the DAVTE on-site evaluation across all six program components ranged from (2.77) about moderate to (2.00) little.

One discriminant function was significant at the .05 level. When one or more discriminant functions was found to be significant, this indicated, in this particular analysis, that a significant difference existed in the reported extent of relationship between improvement in one or more of the six program components and the DAVTE on-site evaluation by at least one of

the selected LEA personnel sub-groups.

The eight LEA personnel sub-groups became arranged into three clusters:

- 1) Administration-Y, Other-non-Administration-N, and Administration-Other-N;
- 2) Instruction-Y, and Administration-N; and Instruction-N, Guidance-N, and
- 3) Administration-Other-Y. The cluster comprised of: Administration-Y, Other-non-Administration-N, and Administration-Other-N reported a greater extent of relationship between improvement in the program component Use of Community Resources and the DAVTE on-site evaluation, and a lesser extent of relationship between improvement in the program components of Personnel and Student Services and the DAVTE on-site evaluation. The cluster comprised of Administration-N and Instruction-Y reported a greater extent of relationship between improvement in the program components of Personnel and Student Services and the DAVTE on-site evaluation and a lesser extent of relationship between improvement in the program component Use of Community Resources and the DAVTE on-site evaluation. The cluster comprised of Instruction-N, Guidance-N and Administration-Other-Y reported relatively small differences in the extent of relationship between improvement among the six program components and the DAVTE on-site evaluation.

The Relationship Between Improvements in
the Occupational Education Program and
the On-Site Evaluation as Reported by
On-Site Evaluation Team Members

The on-site evaluation team members reported that the Occupational Programs program component had the highest combined mean (2.89) for the extent of relationship between improvement and the DAVTE on-site evaluation across all five team member groups. This combined mean indicated about a moderate level of relationship.

The second highest combined mean (2.81) for extent of relationship between improvement and the DAVTE on-site evaluation was reported for the Use of Community Resources program component. In order, the other program components were Planning and Evaluation with a combined mean of 2.70, Program Management with a combined mean of 2.68, Student Services with a combined mean of 2.64, and Personnel with a combined mean of 2.55. The highest reported extent of relationship between improvement and the DAVTE on-site evaluation in the six program components was reported by persons classified as Guidance. The second highest combined mean (2.74) extent of relationship between improvement and the DAVTE on-site evaluation across all six program components was reported by persons classified as Administration. The other team member groups in order of combined means were: Instruction (2.73), Business Industry and Labor Personnel (2.69), and Occupational Students (2.33). The reported extent of relationship between improvements and the DAVTE on-site evaluation in the six program components by each of the five team member groups ranged from (2.83) about moderate to (2.33) somewhat above little.

There was no significant discriminant function as a result of the discriminant analysis. Therefore, no significant differences existed in the reported extent of relationship between improvements and the DAVTE on-site evaluation among the six program components and the five team member sub-groups.

Summary of Findings for Research Question 3

Presented in this section is a summary of the findings for Research Question 3 and its subquestions. The findings are presented by their source of data: 1) LEA Personnel Follow-Up Questionnaire, and 2) Team Member Follow-Up Questionnaire.

Research Question 3 was:

Did the LEA occupational education personnel and the members of the on-site evaluation teams see the on-site evaluation as being of value?

The Value of the On-Site Evaluation
as Reported by LEA Personnel

LEA personnel reported that the on-site evaluation would help them to improve their occupational education program. Over 69% of the respondents reported that the on-site evaluation was beneficial to their occupational education program. There was no significant difference found between the value of the DAVTE on-site evaluation and LEA personnel assignment.

LEA personnel also reported that the on-site evaluation was not a waste of time and money in terms of its impact on their occupational education program. Two-thirds of the respondents reported that the on-site evaluation was not a waste of time and money. There was no significant difference found between the impact value of the DAVTE on-site evaluation and LEA personnel assignment.

LEA Personnel Perceived Value of Activities
Related to the On-Site Evaluation

LEA personnel reported that the orientation meeting for the on-site evaluation provided them with an adequate understanding of the on-site evaluation process. Over 80% of the respondents reported that the orientation meeting provided them with an adequate understanding of the on-site evaluation process. LEA personnel with an administrative assignment reported a significantly higher level of value for the orientation meeting in providing an understanding of the DAVTE on-site evaluation process, while

those persons with a guidance assignment reported the lowest level of value.

LEA personnel reported that the on-site evaluation helped them to become much more familiar with their district's One and Five Year Plan for Occupational Education than they were before the on-site visit. Over half of the respondents reported that they were much more familiar with their district's One and Five Year Plan for Occupational Education as a result of the on-site visit. LEA personnel with an instructional or administrative assignment gained a higher level of familiarity while persons with a guidance assignment reported the lowest level of gaining familiarity.

LEA personnel also reported that the activities they were involved in while preparing for the on-site evaluation were beneficial. Almost half of the respondents reported that the activities they were involved in while preparing for the DAVTE on-site evaluation were beneficial to themselves. LEA personnel with an administrative assignment reported a significantly higher level of benefit while persons with a guidance assignment reported a lower level of benefit from the activities.

Involvement of LEA Personnel in Preparing for the On-Site Evaluation

LEA personnel reported their level of involvement in preparing for the on-site evaluation for ten selected activities.

The faculty meetings activity received the highest combined mean (2.93) for level of involvement across all eight selected LEA personnel sub-groups. This combined mean indicated that the eight LEA personnel sub-groups combined reported their level of involvement in faculty meetings as being moderate.

The second highest combined mean (2.90) for level of involvement was reported for the activity of discussions with other faculty members. In

order, the other activities were: reviewing occupational course objectives with a combined mean of 2.67, conducting self-evaluation activities with a combined mean of 2.66, reviewing occupational program goals with a combined mean of 2.59, discussions with occupational education administrators with a combined mean of 2.55, reviewing Local District One and Five Year Plan with a combined mean of 2.49, discussions with guidance personnel with a combined mean of 2.33, meeting with an advisory committee with a combined mean of 2.32, and meeting with occupational student organizations with a combined mean of 1.69. The reported level of involvement in the ten selected activities ranged from (2.93) moderate to (1.69) less than little.

The LEA personnel sub-group that reported the highest combined mean (2.84) level of involvement across all ten selected activities were comprised of those persons classified as Administration-Other with experience on a DAVTE on-site evaluation team. The other LEA personnel sub-groups in order of combined means were: Administration with experience on a DAVTE on-site evaluation team (2.61), Instruction with experience on a DAVTE on-site evaluation team (2.58), Administration with no experience on a DAVTE on-site evaluation team (2.52), Administration-Other with no experience on a DAVTE on-site evaluation team (2.38), Other-non-Administration with no experience on a DAVTE on-site evaluation team (1.87). The reported level of involvement across all ten selected activities by each of the eight LEA personnel sub-groups ranged from (2.84) about moderate to (1.87) about little.

LEA personnel sub-groups with experience on a DAVTE on-site evaluation team reported a higher level of involvement across all ten activities than did the other LEA personnel sub-groups with no experience on a DAVTE on-site evaluation team.

Two discriminant functions were significant at the .05 level. Since

two discriminant functions were found to be significant, this indicated that a significant difference in the reported levels of involvement in the ten selected activities by the LEA personnel sub-groups.

With respect to the first discriminant function, the eight LEA personnel sub-groups were arranged into three clusters: 1) Other-non-Administration-N, Instruction-N, and Administration-Other-Y; 2) Administration-Other-N, Administration-Y, Instruction-Y, and Administration-N; and 3) Guidance-N. The cluster comprised of: Other-non-Administration-N, Instruction-N, and Administration-Other-Y reported a greater level of involvement in discussions with other faculty members and reviewing occupational course objectives and a lesser involvement in discussions with guidance personnel. The cluster comprised of Guidance-N reported a greater level of involvement in discussions with guidance personnel and a lesser level of involvement in discussions with other faculty members and reviewing occupational course objectives. The cluster comprised of: Administration-Other-N, Administration-Y, Instruction-Y, and Administration-N reported relatively small differences in their level of involvement among the ten selected activities.

With respect to the second discriminant function, it was concluded that the eight LEA personnel sub-groups were arranged into three clusters: 1) Administration-Y, and Administration-Other-Y; 2) Instruction-N, Guidance-N, Instruction-Y, and Other-non-Administration-N; and 3) Administration-N, and Administration-Other-N. The cluster comprised of Administration-Y and Administration-Other-Y reported a greater level of involvement in meeting with advisory committees, reviewing Local District One and Five Year Plans, and discussions with guidance personnel and a lesser involvement in discussions with other faculty members and reviewing occupational course

objectives. The cluster comprised of Instruction-N, Guidance-N, Instruction-Y, and Other-non-Administration-N reported a greater level of involvement in discussions with other faculty members and reviewing occupational course objectives and a lesser involvement in meeting with advisory committees, reviewing Local District One and Five Year Plans, and discussions with guidance personnel. The cluster comprised of Administration-N and Administration-Other-N reported relatively small differences in their level of involvement among the ten selected activities.

The Value of the On-Site Evaluation as

Reported by On-Site Evaluation

Team Members

On-site evaluation team members reported that the on-site evaluation would have a positive effect on the district's occupational education program. Almost 90% of the respondents reported that the on-site evaluation would have a positive effect on the district's occupational education program. On-site evaluation team members classified as Guidance reported that the DAVTE on-site evaluation will have a less positive effect on the district's occupational education program than the other members of the on-site evaluation teams.

The on-site evaluation team members reported that the on-site evaluation was not a waste of time and money in terms of its impact on improving the district's occupational education program. Almost 90% of the respondents reported that the on-site evaluation was worth their time and effort. There was no significant difference between the perceived attitude of the LEA personnel toward the DAVTE on-site evaluation and team member sub-groups.

Team Member Reported Value of the DAVTE On-Site
Evaluation to the Members of the DAVTE
On-Site Evaluation Team

On-site evaluation team members reported that the experience obtained as a member of an on-site evaluation team would be valuable to anyone concerned with occupational education. All (100%) of the respondents reported that the experience was a valuable experience. There was no significant difference found between the value of the DAVTE on-site evaluation experience by team member sub-groups.

The on-site evaluation team members also reported that the on-site evaluation team experience had encouraged them to work further for the improvement of occupational education in their own district. Over 96% of the respondents reported that the experience had encouraged them to help improve their own occupational education program. There was no significant difference found between the level of encouragement and team member sub-groups.

The on-site evaluation team members reported that during their interviews with the LEA personnel they got some good ideas on how to improve their own occupational education programs. Over 85% of the respondents reported that they had received some good ideas for improving their own occupational education program from the LEA personnel that they interviewed. There was no significant difference found between the extent of obtaining good ideas for improving their occupational education program and team member sub-groups.

Discussion

This study has identified several aspects of the occupational education programs in Illinois that have been improved since the time of the first on-site evaluation. There has been differential levels of improvement by the various program components. Also, in some cases, the level of improvement for some of the program components was reported to be different by the various reference groups providing evaluative ratings.

The on-site evaluation teams at the time of the first on-site evaluation attempted to rate the quality of the 8 Areas of Concern by the use of an absolute rating scale based on the "ability" or resources of the LEA. Summary ratings for the LEA were found to be confusing and often counter-productive and, therefore, were discontinued; no further attempts to develop an absolute measure of program quality for LEAs or the program components were made.

No program quality index existed for use and this study did not attempt to develop such an index. The measures used in this study were those reported by the individuals composing the various groups which gave their perceptions of the attribute being rated. Therefore, the members of the different groups very likely rated the same attribute differently; each relative to their own perception of the value or extent of the attribute they perceived to exist.

Although the reported levels of improvement were not based on an absolute index of program quality, their use in this study does provide an adequate basis for determining program improvement. The on-site evaluation phase of the TPS was developed to assist the LEAs to improve their occupational education programs, whether that involved taking a

poor program and helping it become an average program or taking a good program and helping it become an excellent program. While occupational education students, LEA personnel and team members may have reported different relative levels of improvement based on their own perceptions, the primary concern for this study was whether or not these groups found improvement.

This section relates the ratings of LEA programs and ratings of improvements to the DAVTE on-site evaluation and the literature related to program evaluation.

There were several significant improvements reported for the Planning and Evaluation program component; this program component included objectives and evaluation which were separate Areas of Concern at the first on-site evaluation. LEA occupational education personnel reported that they were more involved in planning their LEA's One and Five Year Plan for Occupational Education than they were at the time of the first evaluation. Bowling (1973) found in his study of the Illinois TPS that LEAs which had been evaluated by an on-site evaluation team were more likely to involve more of the LEA personnel in developing the One and Five Year Plan than were involved in unevaluated LEAs. He also found that LEA personnel with an administrative assignment were significantly more involved in this activity than were any other LEA personnel. This study had similar findings: personnel with administrative assignments were more involved in all aspects, and persons who had served on on-site evaluation teams were more involved at their own LEA than were those who had not served on a team.

The ETRs for the second on-site evaluation indicated that substantial improvement had been made in the use of stated and measurable objectives

and in the use of local evaluation activities by the LEAs. Bowling (1973) stated, "The evaluation teams (first on-site evaluation) were most concerned about the areas of objectives and evaluation (p. 136)." As a result of this concern, the DAVTE undertook a statewide program to assist LEA personnel in developing stated and measurable objectives and also developed the Locally Directed Evaluation program to assist the LEAs in conducting their own evaluations for program improvement. The emphasis placed on these two aspects of the Planning and Evaluation program component by the first on-site evaluation teams and DAVTE is reflected in the significant improvement found in this area by the study.

The LEA personnel rated the level of improvement for the Planning and Evaluation program component higher than for any other program component. The school personnel who were at the LEA at the time of the first on-site evaluation were probably involved in developing program and course objectives as well as being involved in evaluation activities and therefore aware of the changes at their LEA from the first to the second team visit.

A somewhat different rating was reported by the on-site evaluation team members; they rated the level of improvement for the Planning and Evaluation program component lower than for any other program component. These seemingly contradictory findings may be the result of several factors. The first is that it is difficult to evaluate (as an outsider) change over time when the rater is using a single point in time as a reference. Secondly, the other five program components are more easily identified with people and/or places whereas Planning and Evaluation is somewhat more abstract. It is also possible that the team members had a higher expectancy for this program component due to the widespread concern for this area over a period of time. They may have been using the DAVTE, LDE materials as the expected standard.

The Student Services program component had very little reported improvement from the time of the first on-site evaluation. Occupational education students reported no improvement in the guidance personnel's knowledge of the world of work or in the information they received from their guidance counselor relative to information about their future career. These areas were rated average by the occupational education students at the time of both on-site evaluations. Industrial oriented students rated the guidance counselors' knowledge of the world of work significantly lower than did the other occupational education students.

Bowling (1973) indicated that most of the early changes implemented in the guidance services area were in the area of placement services. This early change was somewhat substantiated by the improvement found in the placement services as a result of the analysis of the ETRs. The ETRs also indicated that more career information was available to occupational education students at the time of the second visit.

The LEA personnel rated the level of improvement for the Student Services program component fourth relative to the improvement in the six program components. The comparatively little improvement reported for this program component by occupational education students was similar to the findings from analysis of the ETRs and LEA personnel ratings. The on-site evaluation team members rated the level of improvement for the Student Services program component fifth. Therefore, improvement in the Student Services program component area was rated fifth on an over all basis.

The Occupational Programs program component was found to have received differential levels of reported improvement from the time of the first on-site evaluation. Occupational education students reported no difference, no improvement, in the value of their programs in preparing

them for an occupation. It was interesting to note that students in home economics rated their program significantly lower in terms of preparation for an occupation than did the students in the other occupational education areas.

One major concern was found in student membership in vocational clubs. A very significant drop in the percent of students who reported membership was reported by the occupational education students in all areas except in the agriculture area. There was little mention of student membership by the ETRs for the first on-site evaluation (Bowling, 1973) or for the second visit.

An improvement in the sequencing of courses into programs was indicated by the analysis of the ETRs. Also, more LEAs were offering programs in all five program areas than were doing so at the time of the first on-site evaluation. Bowling (1973) found that the major area of change made by evaluated LEAs (first on-site evaluation) in the Occupational Programs program component was in the renaming of courses and minor course changes which allowed for the sequencing of courses into programs.

A major finding in the Occupational Programs program component was the substantial increase in the number of conclusions made by the second on-site evaluation team reports in comparison to the first on-site evaluation team reports; totals for the 15 LEAs were 85 conclusions for the first on-site evaluation and 295 conclusions for the second on-site evaluation. Also, the nature of the conclusions was different. The ETRs for the second on-site evaluation contained conclusions concerning individual program areas in addition to general conclusions for the total Occupational Programs component whereas the first team reports reported only the latter. LEA personnel from guidance and the individual occupational areas expressed concern about not having a member on the team from their area.

This increase in emphasis on the individual occupational program areas within the Occupational Programs component may indicate a need to reevaluate the method of selecting on-site evaluation team members. As structured some teams did not have a knowledgeable representative for each program area or for guidance.

The LEA personnel rated the level of improvement for their Occupational Programs program component second relative to the six program components. As most of the LEA personnel were actively involved in the occupational programs it would seem likely that they would be in a position to be knowledgeable of any improvements that had taken place. The on-site evaluation team members rated the level of improvement for the Occupational Programs program component higher than for any other program component. Several factors may be involved in this finding. As stated earlier a substantial increase in the emphasis placed on the Occupational Programs program component by the on-site evaluation teams was found. This change in emphasis may have caused the team members to spend more of their time evaluating this program component, thus finding more improvements.

As with the Occupational Programs program component, differential levels of improvement were reported for the Personnel program component. Occupational education students reported improvement in their occupational instructors' knowledge of the world of work. It was interesting to note that students in the health occupations program area rated their instructors' knowledge of the world of work significantly higher than the students in each of the other program areas. This finding should not be too surprising since the typical background of health occupations instructors involves some type of current certification and experience in one or more of the health fields along with, or followed by, the professional education

courses necessary to teach. Further, these programs typically involve an operational setting, clinical experience. Home economics students rated their instructors' knowledge of the world of work significantly lower than the students in each of the other program areas; this finding is consistent with the significantly lower rating given by the students of these programs in terms of preparation for an occupation.

LEA personnel reported an improvement in the working relationship between occupational and academic instructors but reported no change in the working relationship between occupational instructors and guidance personnel. Bowling (1973) reported that most LEAs were planning in-school workshops as a part of their personnel development program. These workshops were to include instructors and guidance personnel. It is interesting that an improvement was reported in the academic/occupational instructor working relationship but not for the working relationships with guidance personnel. Guidance personnel were less involved in all aspects of the occupational education program than other LEA personnel groups.

LEA personnel rated the level of improvement for the Personnel program component lower than for any other program component. The on-site evaluation team members rated the level of improvement in this program component fifth relative to the six program components. These two findings tend to agree with each other in terms of the relative level of improvement for the Personnel program component.

A significant finding in the Program Management program component was in the reported improvement, by LEA personnel and second visit ETRs, in support by the LEA Board of Education for occupational education. The LEA personnel and on-site evaluation team members agreed on the relative level (somewhat moderate) of improvement for the Program Management

program component. The LEA personnel rated the level of improvement for this program component fourth relative to the other program components; the team members rated the level of improvement third.

For the program component Use of Community Resources, LEA personnel reported no significant improvement in the working relationship between occupational instructors and members of the community. This finding was somewhat contradicted by the analysis of the ETRs. The ETRs for the second on-site evaluation indicated an improvement in the establishment and use of local advisory committees. Bowling (1973) found that most evaluated LEAs (first on-site evaluation) had reported that the LEAs were planning to establish and utilize advisory committees more than they had in the past. An improvement was found in this study in the use of advisory committees.

As with the Program Management program component, the LEA personnel and on-site evaluation team members agreed to the relative level of improvement for the Use of Community Resources. The LEA personnel rated the level of improvement third relative to the other program components; the team members rated the level of improvement second.

Major Findings

Both LEA personnel and on-site evaluation team members agreed that there had been some degree of improvement in all occupational education program components and that the on-site evaluation had contributed to that improvement.

Both LEA personnel and team members reported that the on-site evaluations were a beneficial and worthwhile investment of resources.

Both LEA personnel and on-site evaluation team members reported that participation in the on-site evaluation was of benefit to themselves and to their LEA occupational education program.

There was a high degree of agreement between the content of the

Evaluation Team Reports written by the on-site evaluation teams at the time of the on-site visits and the team members expressed viewpoints at a point in time following the on-site visit.

There was a high level of agreement between the viewpoints expressed by the LEA personnel via the PEI-P at the time of the orientation meeting held prior to the on-site visit and the viewpoints expressed via a follow-up questionnaire completed at a point in time following the on-site visit.

LEA personnel with an administrative assignment generally rated the working relationships among the various LEA personnel groups and the board of education and the benefits of the on-site evaluation higher than those persons without an administrative assignment.

Guidance personnel generally rated all aspects of the occupational education program and the on-site evaluation phase lower than other LEA personnel.

LEA personnel became involved in a higher level of interactions, meeting with advisory committees and other activities related to program improvement while preparing for the on-site visit. Guidance personnel were the least involved of all LEA groups. Those LEA persons who had previously served on an on-site evaluation team were more involved in the on-site visit of their own LEA than were those who had not served on a team.

LEA personnel tended to rate the level of improvement in components in which they were involved higher than they rated the other program components where they were less involved.

LEA personnel and on-site evaluation team members rated the level of improvement in the six program components as being from somewhat more than little to moderate.

LEA personnel and on-site evaluation team members generally agreed as to the relative level of improvement in each of the program components.

The relative amount of improvement by program component over the five year time period was, highest to lowest: Occupation Programs, Use of Community Resources, Planning and Evaluation, Program Management, Student Services, and Personnel.

Student membership in vocational clubs has declined from the time of the first on-site evaluation and relatively less instructor involvement was reported for this area.

Conclusions

Based on the results of this study and the discussion presented, the following conclusions seem appropriate.

On-site evaluations conducted by evaluation teams contribute to improvement in LEA occupational education programs.

Guidance personnel are less involved in the occupational education programs than other groups of LEA personnel and report the least benefit from participation in the on-site evaluation process. Guidance personnel are not extensively or actively involved in interactions with occupational education personnel or on-site evaluation teams.

Activities initiated by DAVTE as a result of concerns brought out by the earlier on-site evaluations have been responded to and are reflected in the improvement of occupational education programs.

Investment in the on-site evaluation process for occupational education programs returns various types of benefits to the LEA occupational programs and personnel.

LEA personnel who serve as an on-site evaluation team member tend to gain benefits for their own program and to become more involved in their own program.

Outside personnel serving on on-site evaluation teams and LEA personnel have a high level of agreement concerning the nature of the LEA programs and their changes over time.

There has been an increased emphasis on evaluation of the individual occupational programs by the on-site evaluation teams as a part of the on-site evaluation.

The evaluation team reports for the second on-site evaluation are far more extensive than for the first on-site evaluation.

Recommendations

The DAVTE on-site evaluation should be continued with some modifications.

DAVTE should establish mechanisms and procedures to gain a more widespread involvement across all LEA personnel groups for participation in the on-site evaluation team process.

DAVTE should establish mechanisms and procedures to gain more involvement of guidance personnel both in the operating occupational education programs and on the on-site evaluation teams.

DAVTE should consider recruiting and assigning additional guidance personnel to the on-site evaluation teams so that at least one guidance counselor will be on each on-site evaluation team.

With the increased emphasis placed on the individual occupational programs as a part of the on-site evaluations, it is recommended that DAVTE evaluate the present criteria used in establishing the on-site evaluation

teams. It is possible that having at least one team member from each of the five program areas on the team will improve the on-site evaluation process and the local occupational education programs.

DAVTE should develop a program of activities directed towards improving the current low involvement of occupational education students in vocational clubs if participation in such activities is a goal of DAVTE.

DAVTE should establish a computer based data library for the data collected as a part of the on-site evaluation phase to provide a basis for further studies of the TPS on-site evaluation.

Further studies should be conducted to determine how LEA personnel are involved in implementing the improvements recommended by the on-site evaluation team and the development of the LEA occupational education program and the One and Five Year Plan after the on-site evaluation is completed.

List of References

- Bowling, D.E. An assessment of impact of feedback of a final evaluation report of the Illinois evaluation system upon occupational programs. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois, 1973.
- Illinois State Board of Education. Three phase system for statewide evaluation of occupational education programs: Team member handbook. Springfield, Ill.: Author, 1978.
- Illinois State Board of Vocational Education and Rehabilitation. A state plan for the administration of vocational and technical education in Illinois. Springfield, Ill.: Author, September 1969.
- The education amendments of 1976. Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1976.
- The vocational education act of 1963. Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1963.
- The vocational amendments of 1966. Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966.
- Wentling, T.L. and Klit, J.A. Stop, look, and evaluate: Evaluation for decision making. Illinois Career Education Journal, 1972, 29(2), 46-50.
- Wentling, T.L. and Lawson, T.E. Evaluating occupational education and training programs. Boston, Allyn and Bacon, 1975.